







THE  
TAITTIRĪYA-PRĀTISĀKHYA

*With its Commentary the Tribhāshyaratna : Text,  
Translation and Notes*

WILLIAM D. WHITNEY

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS  
DELHI :: PATNA :: VARANASI

**©MOTILAL BANARSIDASS**

**Head Office : BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHARNAGAR, DELHI-7**  
**Branches : 1. CHOWK, VARANASI (U.P.)**  
**2. ASHOK RAJPATH (OPP. PATNA COLLEGE),**  
**PATNA-4 (BIHAR)**

**First Edition : New Haven, 1863**

**Reprint : Delhi, 1973**

**Price : Rs. 40.00**

**Printed in India**

**BY SHANTILAL JAIN, AT SHRI JAINENDRA PRESS, BUNGALOW ROAD  
JAWAHARNAGAR, DELHI-7 AND PUBLISHED BY SUNDARLAL JAIN FOR  
MOTILAL BANARSIDASS, BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHARNAGAR, DELHI-7**

ARTICLE I.

---

THE TĀITTIRĪYA-PRĀTICĀKHYA,

WITH ITS COMMENTARY,

THE TRIBHĀSHYARATNA:

TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES.

BY WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,  
PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN YALE COLLEGE.

---

Presented to the Society October 14th, 1868.

---

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

THE manuscript material on which is founded this edition of the Tāittirīya-Prāticākhyā and Tribhāshyaratna is as follows:

1. **T.** A copy of the text of the treatise alone, in a modern hand, on light-colored paper. It was sent me by Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, from Benares, in 1857, and appears to be a copy made for him from some older manuscript: but it contains no intimation of its own date or of that of its original; presenting at the end, in place of the usual colophon, the beginning of a list of words which in *pada*-text show a final *n*. It is distinctly and correctly written. On the back is inscribed "Krishṇa-yajuh-prātisākhyā, by Kārtikeya." On what ground this ascription of authorship is made, I do not know; it does not, so far as I am aware, find support from any other quarter.

2. **W.** A copy of the text and commentary together, each separate rule being followed by its own comment. This manuscript, like the preceding, I owe to the kindness of Prof. Hall. It is handsomely written, in a large clear hand, and fills 146 leaves (numbered 1-89, 100, 1-56), measuring about four and a half by nine and a half inches. To the end of 25<sup>a</sup>, seven lines are written on a page; thenceforward, nine lines. It has no statement of scribe, place, or date; but I imagine that a final leaf, with the end of the colophon, had been lost or destroyed some time before it was sent to me. The part remaining reads as follows: *crikrshnār-pabhastu crikrabhadhāiravaprasann om yāyakāmādaravidhdyordhvam rshayor rshayo rshih: ity dīgśraçimakāpūrvam rsham eti svatam-tratā: 1 kramyādhvano bhavaty agre pāvako rpayatiti ca.* This just fills up the leaf; but another hand has written below, at its edge, what purports to be the ending of the second verse: *visha-*

*yemgira ity evāpy agra ity ādi lupyate.* 2., and has added as final benediction, *grīvīgeçvaraprasann.*

This is a virgin manuscript, containing neither erasures, insertions, nor alterations. Considering that it thus presents every first fault of its scribe unamended, it is very good and correct. Through the first twelve chapters, the rules of the Prātiçākhyā are distinguished from the commentary by being rubbed over with a red powder.

3. **B.** This authority comes from the west of India, where (see Dr. Bühler, in *Zeitsch. Deut. Morg. Ges.*, xxii.319) the Tribhāsh-yaratna is said to be not very rare. From a manuscript there collected, a copy was made under direction of Dr. Bühler for the Berlin library, and forwarded to Prof. Weber, at whose friendly suggestion and instance it was transcribed for me, in roman letters, by Dr. Siegfried Goldschmidt, to whom I desire here to express my gratitude for a service so valuable and so kindly rendered. The manuscript contains more inaccuracies of reading than any of the others which I have used, yet they are in the main superficial, and the text given is a pretty complete and correct one.

4. **O.** Through the kind offices of Prof. Max Müller, I have been enabled to procure a collation (made with a copy of my own manuscript, "W.") of the incomplete Oxford manuscript (MS. Bodl. W. 478), first described by Roth (*Zur Lit. und Gesch. des Weda*, pp. 54, 62 seq.), and used also by Weber (*Ind. Stud.* iv.77 seq.). It begins in the middle of the comment upon iii.12, thus lacking somewhat less than a quarter of the entire work.

5. **G.** This is a romanized copy of a manuscript which belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and is written on strips of palm leaf, in the Grantham character. The copy was made for me by Dr. Julius Eggeling, who has thus laid me under deep obligation, and contributed most essentially to the success of my work. Hardly less than to him is my indebtedness to Dr. Reinhold Rost, Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, who notified me of the existence of the manuscripts in the Society's library soon after their discovery, and who suggested and aided their transcription. There are doubtless few other Sanskritists in Europe, besides these gentlemen, to whom works written in the southern Indian characters are not sealed books, and there can be none, I am sure, who evince a more liberal readiness to make their peculiar knowledge of service to the rest. The catalogue which Dr. Rost is preparing to publish of the Royal Asiatic Society's collection of manuscripts will give such other particulars respecting age, condition, etc., as I am compelled here to omit.

6. **M.** The library of the same Society also contains a second copy of the Prātiçākhyā and its commentary, written on paper, in the Malayālam character. Of this, Dr. Eggeling has taken the pains to note the various readings as compared with the Grantham manuscript, in his transcript of the latter.

Both these manuscripts from southern India are so arranged

that the rules of the Prātiçākhya are given first, in a body, and are followed by the commentary, also in bulk

As regards the text of the Prātiçākhya itself, all these authorities agree very closely: there are but two or three cases of well-established variations of reading among them. In respect to the text of the commentary, their accordance, as was to be expected, is much less: they fall, in fact, into three well-marked classes; or, as one might say, present three different recensions of the work. The two codices belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society, the Grantham ("G.") and the Malayālam ("M."), stand in the nearest possible relation to one another, having almost all their errors, omissions, and orthographical peculiarities in common, and only by comparatively rare and inconspicuous differences proved not to be copied the one from the other. My own manuscript ("W.") and that sent by Dr. Bühler from Bombay ("B.") also offer substantially the same text, although their differences are much more frequent, and of a more important character, than those of G. and M. As for the Oxford manuscript ("O."), it is, in its earlier portions, pretty closely accordant with W. and B., having an especially near relationship to B., with whose slight variations of the text given by W. it almost uniformly agrees; later, however, it strikes off upon a track of its own, and comes to differ from both the other recensions in a much greater degree than they differ between themselves.

Such being the case, I have thought it best to adopt for publication the version offered by W., partly because this is the only one for which I possess an original manuscript (and a tolerably old and correct one), partly because it is, upon the whole, better supported than that of G. and M.—which, as I have shown above, can hardly be reckoned, both together, as constituting more than a single manuscript. I have accordingly, avoiding the making up of an eclectic text from the various recensions, followed W. as closely as I could; and especially, when it was supported by the joint authority of B. and O., or of B. alone—thus sometimes, undoubtedly, rejecting an intrinsically preferable and perhaps more original reading given by one or another of the remaining authorities, if that offered by W. was of a character to be endured. At the end of the comment to each rule are given the various readings of all the manuscripts, with sufficient fullness, I hope, to answer the desirable ends of critical comparison. Obvious and trifling errors of transcription, of course, I have not noted, but only those which made a false reading or tended to become such: I have been most liberal in overlooking the blunders of B., as being, on the whole, of least consequence.

In regard, however, to the two matters of punctuation and euphonic combination, I have taken liberties with the text of which I have given no account. The various manuscripts are in no slight degree discordant with one another, inconsistent with themselves, and careless of the requirements of the sense, in the use they make of the signs of interpunction: they offer absolutely

no standard to follow. For the occurrence of the signs as printed, therefore, I am alone responsible; and no one who can anywhere make a better division of clauses than I have made need be restrained from so doing by the belief that he is running counter to manuscript authority. Again, I have (except in certain cases at the end of a cited rule or passage, where a reference follows) put all the words of the commentary in euphonic combination according to the usual rules; while in the manuscripts (as is common in exegetical writings) they are very frequently, for the sake of greater clearness, separated from one another.\* Here, too, the usage of the various authorities is too discordant and irregular to be followed. And to report their readings in these two particulars would burden the critical notes with a mass of useless and wearisome details.

In the same manner are treated such orthographical peculiarities of the several manuscripts as that G. and M. regularly write a final sibilant instead of *visv̄janīya* before an initial sibilant, and often, where a *m* is assimilated to a following mute, write the nasal mute corresponding to the latter, instead of *anusvāra*. Moreover, in the representation of the nasal sounds, by the nasal consonants, *anusvāra* (ñ), or *m*, I have followed a consistent method, with disregard of the manuscript usage.

The text given at the foot of the page contains the whole comment, with two exceptions: citations from the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā, being written out in full, with references, in the notes to the rules, are indicated below only by first words or letters, with signs of omission added; and again, where lists of affected words are given in a rule, in euphonic combination, and repeated, separate, at the beginning of the comment, they are replaced by signs of omission, as having been sufficiently presented uncombined in the translation of the rule. Errors of reading in the cited passages themselves are passed without notice, unless of such importance as to cast doubt upon the identity of the passage; but, on the other hand, the frequent differences of the versions as regards the extent of the illustrative passage cited are fully noted in the sequel of the reference.

I have preferred, instead of giving an express and direct translation of the commentary, to work its substance fully into my own notes upon the rules, somewhat as in my edition of the Atharva Prātiçākhyā (Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, Vol. vii., 1862). The different conditions of the case, however, impress quite a different character upon the present work. The completeness and elaborateness of the Tribhāshyaratna make its working-up by far the larger and more important part of what is to be done in illustration of the Prātiçākhyā. Possessing no *index verborum* to the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā, nor even a manuscript of its *pada*-text, I have not been able to try the Prātiçākhyā by it with anything like the same

---

\* Thus, to instance an extreme case, at the end of the comment on iv.10, the manuscripts read (for once, with almost perfect unanimity): *iṅgyasya antah iṅgyāntah na iṅgyāntah aniṅgyāntah*.

thoroughness as in the case of the similar treatise to the Atharvan. What could be done in the way of testing and supplementing the rules given, by a careful reading and excerptation of the Sanhitā in a single good *sūnihilatā*-manuscript (also procured for me in India by Dr. Hall, and with one or two slight deficiencies in it made up from Berlin, by Prof. Weber), I have endeavored to do. I have been able to refer points of interest connected with the text, in its *sūnihilatā* or *prādu* readings, to friends in Europe owning or having access to fuller manuscript material, namely to Professors Weber of Berlin and Haug of München, and have received from them important aid, which I desire here gratefully to acknowledge. Of references to the teachings of the other Prātiçākhyas I have been much more sparing in this than in the former work, in order to avoid repetition: and, for the same reason, some matters of theory which were pretty fully discussed there receive here a more compendious treatment. The present work, in short, to a certain extent presupposes the other—not, however, in such a manner or degree as should interfere with its independence and separate intelligibility.

In making reference to the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā, I have used only three principal numbers, to designate book, chapter, and section, or *kāṇḍu*, *prāgnā*, and *unuvāku*. The further division of the sections or *unneākcas*, where they are of more considerable length, into parcels of fifty words each, is so artificial, destructive of the natural connection of passages, detrimental to the proper phonetic form of the text, and wholly ignored by the Prātiçākhya (see notes to the rules of chapter iii.), that I have preferred to express it by the use of "superior" figures attached to that which indicates the *unuvāku*. Of course, where such attached figure is wanting, the *unuvāku* is to be understood as composed of a single division.

In the notes of various readings, each figure refers only to the single word to which it is attached, unless a passage of more than one word is included between two repetitions of the same figure; in which case the reference figure, in the notes, is put within parentheses. The abbreviation "om." means 'omit,' and "ins." means 'insert.'

In all transliterated passages of Sanskrit, a colon stands in place of a single stroke of interpunction, and a full stop in place of a double stroke. The general method of transliteration is the same with that which I have hitherto used in the Journal of the American Oriental Society; it will be sufficiently understood from the alphabet given in the note to i.1 (p. 10).

## CHAPTER I.

CONTENTS: 1-11, enumeration and classification of sounds composing the alphabet; 12-14, surd and sonant consonants; 15, list of prepositions; 16-21, 27, names of letters and classes of letters; 22-24, 28, terminology of cited words, etc.; 25, 26, 29, 30, respecting the interpretation of rules; 31-37, quantity of simple sounds; 38-40, the three accents; 41-47, details respecting the circumflex accent; 48, 49, compound words; 50-53, respecting cited words; 54-55, words consisting of a single vowel; 56-61, further specifications respecting the interpretation of rules.

THE commentator begins his work with a couple of rather awkwardly-constructed verses, as follows: "I, bowing low with devoted affection to the two feet of Ganeśa, as also to the *gurus* and to divine Voice, shall proceed to utter this comment; which, made upon examination of the exposition of the Prātiçākhyā given by Vararuci etc., shines, a Treasure of Threefold Comment (*tribhāshyuratna*), approved of Brahmans." He adds an exposition of their meaning, explaining *girām devīm*, 'divine Voice,' by *vāgdevīm*, 'Goddess of Voice,' and *bhūsura*, 'Brahman' (literally 'earth-god'), by *vidvat*, 'learned man, sage.' On *lakshana*, which, as name of a comment, is least in accordance

'bhaktiyuktah prāṇamya 'ham ganeśacaraṇadvayam:  
gurūn api girām<sup>1</sup> devīm idāṁ vakṣyāmi lakshanam.<sup>1</sup>  
vyākhyānam prātiçākhyasya vīkṣhya vāraruçādikam<sup>2</sup>:  
kr̥taṁ tribhāshyaratnām yad bhāsate bhūsurapriyam.<sup>2</sup>

*çlokayor anayor ayam<sup>4</sup> arthah. bhaktiyukto 'ham ganeśacaraṇadvayam gurūn girām<sup>5</sup> api devīm: "vāgdevīm ity arthah: tāṁ ca<sup>6</sup> prāṇamya lakṣaṇam idāṁ vakṣyāmi yaḥ lakṣaṇām tribhāshyaratnāmakaṁ bhūsurapriyam vidvatpriyam bhāsate: kīrtī-<sup>7</sup>caṁ lakṣaṇam: prātiçākhyasya vyākhyānarūpakaṁ<sup>8</sup> vāraruçādikam<sup>9</sup> bhāshyajātām vīkṣhya<sup>10</sup> nyūnditirekaparihārena kr̥taṁ vi-<sup>11</sup>rācitam: ādiçabdenā "treyamāhisheyā gṛhyete: ata eva tribhāshyaratnam iti nāma upapattiḥ: trayāmā bhāshyāndām samā-<sup>12</sup>hāras tribhāshyam: tasya<sup>13</sup> ratnam bhūṣaṇam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. prefaces with *grīgañcāya namah. grīgañcā prasanno 'stu. om.* B. prefaces with *grīgañcāya namah. grīsañcāsavyātīnamah. grīdattāñcāyāya namah:* and the additional verse

*rūkliñbaradharam devam çārivaraṇām caturbhujam:  
prasannavañanam dhyāyet sarvavighnopañcayē.*<sup>1</sup>

'The white-vestment-bearing god, moon-hued, four-armed, propitious-faced, must one meditate on, in order to the ceaseless of all disturbance.' It then numbers the other verses "2" and "3;" but proceeds to confess the un genuineness of the inserted verse by reading, like the other MSS., *anayoh çlokayoh.*

<sup>2</sup> G. M. *girān.* <sup>3</sup> B. *var-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. *girām.* <sup>6</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>7</sup> G. M. *tal.* <sup>8</sup> G. M. *-rūpam;* B. *-pūrvakaṁ.* <sup>9</sup> B. *var-*; W. *-ka.* <sup>10</sup> G. M. *samikṣhya.*

<sup>11</sup> W. *om.*

with common usage, he makes no remark. To *vīkshya*, ‘having examined,’ he adds *nyūnātirekaparihārena*, ‘with avoidance of deficiency and redundancy.’ The “etc.” after “Vararuci” is declared to refer to Ātreya and Māhisheya, these three being the authorities upon which the present work is founded, and from which it derives its name. Vararuci and Māhisheya are, indeed, often (about ten times each: see Index) referred to in the sequel, and their discordant views sometimes set forth and discussed: Ātreya has only once (under v.1) the honor of being mentioned. Who is the digester of their three works, and author of the present commentary, which has taken their place and crowded them out of existence, we are not informed; nor, so far as I am aware, has any evidence bearing upon the point been anywhere brought to knowledge. Notice of the different authorities cited by our commentator will be put together in an additional note at the end of this work, for the sake of the light cast by them upon his age.

### अथ वर्णसमाप्तायः ॥१॥

#### 1. Now the list of sounds.

The commentator first gives himself a great deal of trouble to explain the meaning of *atha*, ‘now,’ in the rule. He quotes Amara’s definition of *atho* and *atha* (Amarakosha iii.4.32.8; p. 349 of Deslongchamps’s edition), and points out that, as a variety of meanings is there attributed to *atho*, it is necessary to fix upon a single meaning for it here. In the first place, then, a propitiatory significance is claimed for it, by reason of its equivalence with *om̄*; “since the Cikṣhā-makers declare, ‘*om̄* and *atha* are deemed propitiatory.’” Or, again, it indicates something coming next after another; “the implication being that, next after the reading of the Veda, one should gain a knowledge of the *lakshana*: there hav-

---

1. *maṅgalānantardrambhapraçnakārtṣnyeshv atho athe 'ti maṅgalādyaneyekārthatvād athaçabdasyā "rthanirñayārtham eko 'rtho' niçetavyah: tatra prathamām tāvan maṅgalārthatvam ucyate: tasya prañavasddharmyāt: tathā hi samācakshate çikshākārah:*

*oñkāraç ca 'nraçabdaç ca maṅgalāv iti kīrtitāv iti: áho<sup>3</sup> svid ánantaryārthatd<sup>4</sup>: vedādhyanáñantaram lakshaññāñnam kuryād iti sápekshatvāl lakshāñasya púrvam vedādhigame saty atha lakshāñaparíkshāvasarah: atha vā 'dhikārārtho 'thaçabdah: tv athai 've 'ti vinivartakādhikārakāvadhārakāh (xxii.6) iti vidyamānatvāt: atha varṇasamāmnāyah pāthakramo<sup>5</sup> 'dhikriyata iti sūtrānvayah: sam ity ekibhāve: dñi iti maryāddayām: mnāya ity ánupúrvyeno 'padeçah<sup>6</sup>: ekibhātā akādrādayo varñāh svarabhaktiparyavasānā ánupúrvyena párvaiḥ gishtādir<sup>7</sup> upadishtāh.*

ing been study of the Veda before the *lakshana*, now comes the occasion for the investigation of the *lakshana*.” Here, *lakshana* appears to be used to designate the Prātiśākhya itself, as above it denoted the commentary to the latter. Once more, *atha* is declared to have the force of an introduction or heading, according to rule xxii.6, below: “*tu, atha, and eva* are respectively exceptive, introductory, and limitative;” and the connection of the rule is that *now* the list of sounds, the order of reading (*pāthakruma*), is made the subject of treatment.

The composition of *samāṇḍyā*, ‘list, rehearsal,’ is next pointed out, and the word is stated to mean “the collective sounds, beginning with *a* and ending with the *svarabhakti*, in their order, as taught by former learned men.”

The catalogue itself follows, as understood by the commentator to be taught or implied in the rules of the treatise. First come the vowels, of which only sixteen are reckoned (see rule 5, below): *a, i, and u* have each a short, a long, and a protracted value, *r* only a short and a long, *l* only a short (W. and B. take the pains to write a figure 2 after the long *r*, and a 1 after the *l*, to point out clearly the number of *mora*s they respectively contain; and B. adds after the *āi* and *āu* a 2, for the same purpose); second, the twenty-five mutes (see rule 7); third, the four semivowels (rule 8); and fourth, the six spirants (rule 9). This makes fifty-one sounds, clearly specified and counted in their order in the next succeeding rules. Of the rest, there is no so direct enumeration; the commentator has to infer them from their recognition by rules found in later portions of the treatise. Thus, he finds *anusvāra* acknowledged as an alphabetic element in rule 34 of this chapter, which teaches that it has the quantity of a short vowel; for, he says, “since it is made the substrate of a specific quantity, it is itself a concrete thing, and not, like nasalization, a quality.” A passage from the Cikṣhā, it is true, appears inconsistent with this, but finds its sufficient explanation in the circumstance that that work includes in one expression the concrete thing and its quality. The cited passage is not to be found in the known text of the

---

tāthā hi: a ā ī ī ī u ī ī ī r ī l e ī ī ī o ī ī ī svarāḥ shodaṣa:  
 ka kha ga gha nā ca cha ja jha nā ta tha da dha na ta tha da  
 dha na pa pha ba bha ma iti sparṣāḥ pañcavīñcatih: ya ra la va  
 iti catasro 'ntasthāḥ: ga sha sa ha ḥka<sup>8</sup> ḥpa<sup>9</sup> iti shad' uṣmāṇah:  
 anusvāraç ca (i.34) iti sūtrenā 'nusvāra uktah: kdlaviceshā-  
 grayatvād asdū<sup>11</sup> dharmañ na tv<sup>10</sup> arunāsikavarad<sup>11</sup> dharmah: vi-  
 dher<sup>12</sup> madhyasthānsikya<sup>13</sup> iti cikṣhāvacane<sup>14</sup> sati<sup>15</sup> dharmadhar-  
 minor abhedavivakshayo 'papadyate: atha visarjanīyaḥ  
 (viii.5) ity anena<sup>16</sup> visarjanīya uktah: nāsikāvivarāṇād ānu-  
 nāsikyam (ii.52) ity anena<sup>16</sup> rāṅga uktah: pṛktasvarāt paro  
 lo dām (xiii.16) ity anena<sup>16</sup> lakāra uktah: sp̄iṛgād anuttamād  
 (xxi.12) iti catvāro yamā uktih: rephoshmasaṁyoge repha-  
 svarabhaktir (xxi.15) iti svarabhaktir uktā: anena kramena

Çikshā (and the same is the case with several of the passages quoted later: see the additional notes): it is given again, with more fullness, under viii.15. Next, for the *visarjanīya*, which our Prātiçākhya does not count among the spirants, is given as authority rule 5 of the eighth chapter, a rule introductory to the euphonic changes of a final *h*. The commentator brings in as next constituent of the alphabet an element which he calls *rañga*, and for which he cites the rule (ii.52) that “nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nasal passage.” The word *rañga*, ‘coloring’, though a common name for the nasal tinge of utterance, is not found in our Prātiçākhya, nor even used in the commentary excepting here and under ii.52. What is described in the latter rule is in fact a “quality” (*dharma*), and not a “qualified” or concrete thing (*dharmin*); and its inclusion in the alphabet would stultify the argument with which the inclusion of *unusvāru* was but just now supported. It would seem that the commentator ought to be aiming here at the *nāsikya*, or euphonic insertion between *h* and a following nasal mute, and should quote for it rule xxi.14; he does not otherwise take account of it in his list, while yet it is precisely as well entitled to a place there as are the *yamas*. The nasalized semivowels, it is true, into which *n* and *m* are directed to be converted before *y*, *l*, *v* (v.26–8), are also left out of the enumeration, unless we suppose the *rañga* to be meant to apply to their nasality; and I think it altogether likely that the commentator had them in view in its definition: but this is only avoiding one difficulty by running into two worse ones—namely, by omitting the *nāsikya*, and by reckoning as a member of the alphabet what is really only one of the constituent elements of certain sounds. Further, rule xiii.16 is made the warrant for the lingual *l*, rule xxi.12 for the four *yamas*, and rule xxi.15, finally, for the *svarabhakti*: and the conclusion is reached that “by this process, the number of sixty is clearly derivable from the rules themselves as that of the letters in the Yajur-Veda.”

---

*yājurvedikavarṇānām<sup>17</sup> shashtisāmkhyā sūtrata eva vispashtā drashṭavyād. nanu*

*trishashṭīc catuhshashṭīr vā varnāh cāmbhumate<sup>18</sup> matāh: iti çikshāvacane sati kathām shashtisāmkhyā niyamyate: etāl<sup>19</sup> laukikavādīdikasarvavarnavishayam<sup>20</sup> iti<sup>21</sup> çikshāvacane na virodhāh: atra tu<sup>22</sup> sūtrādir etāvatānī varṇānām<sup>23</sup> evo 'palambhād esha eva<sup>24</sup> nirṇayo varṇitāh.<sup>25</sup>*

*varṇānānī samāmnāyo varṇasamāmnāyāh.*

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. *mañgalādyanekārtha*. <sup>2</sup> W. G. M. *çiksh-*. G. and M. always write *çikshā*, B. and O. always *çikshā*; W. has *ç-* only in one other place (under xiv.28). <sup>3</sup> W. B. *aho*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-ryatī*; W. adds *vā*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *pithe kramo*. <sup>6</sup> W. B. om. <sup>7</sup> W. *çishyādir*. <sup>8</sup> B. *shka*. <sup>9</sup> B. *shpa*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(11)</sup> B. *dharmañatvād anunāsikāh*. <sup>12</sup> G. ins. *ddharma*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *-kād*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *-nām*. <sup>15</sup> B. om.; G. M. *tu*. <sup>16</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>17</sup> W. *-vādī-*. <sup>18</sup> B. *amṛumate*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *tal*. <sup>20</sup> G. M. *-savarṇavarna-*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. ins. *na*. <sup>22</sup> G. M. om. <sup>23</sup> G. M. om. <sup>24</sup> G. M. om. <sup>25</sup> B. *nirṇitāh*.

An objection is now raised and removed. "Considering that the Çikshâ says 'the letters are regarded as sixty-three or sixty-four, in the opinion of Qambhu' (Çikshâ, verse 3; see Weber's edition of the treatise, in his Indische Studien, iv.348-9), how is the number sixty established? Answer: there is no inconsistency with the *dictum* of the Çikshâ, seeing that the latter has in view the whole body of sounds, as used both in the Veda and in common life; while here the determination (of sixty) is derived from the assumption of just so many letters by the rules of the treatise."

The alphabetic scheme is, then, as follows:

Vowels	simple,	<i>a ã ãs i ï ïs u û ûs</i>	9	16
	impure and diphthongs,	<i>r ñ ! e ãi o ûu</i>	7	
Mutes	guttural,	<i>k kh g gh ñ</i>	5	
	palatal,	<i>c ch j jh ñ</i>	5	
	lingual,	<i>t th ð dh ñ</i>	5	
	dental,	<i>t th ð dh ñ</i>	5	
	labial,	<i>p ph b bh m</i>	5	25
	Semivowels,	<i>y r l v</i>	4	
Spirants,		<i>z ç sh s φ h</i>	6	
	Anusvâra,	<i>ñ</i>	1	
Visarjanîya,		<i>h</i>	1	
	Lingual <i>l</i> ,	<i>l</i>	1	
Nâsikya,		(not written)	1	
Yamas,		do.	4	
Svarabhakti,		do.	1	
whole number of letters				60

With the exception of the nasal *y*, *l*, *v*, already referred to, this list includes all the alphabetic sounds treated of by the Prâtîçâkhyâ. For what concerns the peculiarities of their character or classification, see the special rules of which they are the subject; as also, for the differences between the teachings of this and of the other kindred treatises with reference to them. Only the Vâjasaneyi-Prâtîçâkhyâ includes in its text a complete list and enumeration of letters, and that by an afterthought, in a later and less genuine chapter (viii.1-31).

## अथ नवादितः समानाक्षराणि ॥२॥

2. Now the nine at the beginning are simple vowels.

2. *athe 'ti samjnâdhikârdrthah: asmin<sup>1</sup> varnasamâmnâya adita drabhyâ nava varñâh samândâksharasamjnâ bhavanti: 'yathâ: a ã ãs i ï ïs u û ûs<sup>2</sup>. samjnâdyâh<sup>3</sup> prayojanam: dîrghañ samândâkshare savarnapare (x.2) ity addi. nanv idrcî mahatî samjnâ kimarthâ<sup>4</sup>: gîkshâdîcâstraprasiddhyanurôdhâye<sup>5</sup> 'ti brûmah.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *tasmin*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. *a ã ãs ity*

<sup>3</sup> G. M. *-jñâ*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-tham*. <sup>5</sup> G. M.

*om. -di.*

Literally, ‘are homogeneous syllables;’ *samāndākshara* and its correlative *samāndhyakshara*, ‘syllable of combination,’ being the current names for simple vowel and for diphthong; the latter, however, is not used in this treatise. The nine intended are, as shown in the preceding list, *a ā ās i ī īs u ū ūs*. The *r* and *l* vowels are denied the quality of simplicity or homogeneity, although their structure as composed of heterogeneous elements is not further described; the Rik Pr. (xiii.14), the Vāj. Pr. (iv.145), and the Ath. Pr. (i.37-9) give the details of their formation, while nevertheless the two first expressly include *r* and *l* among the *samāndāksharas* (omitting *l*, apparently, because no case anywhere occurs that should test its quality), and the same classification is inferrably recognized by the last.

The commentator explains the *atha* of this rule as signifying the introduction of the subject of names or technical appellations (*sainjñā*), and cites, as example of the use of the term, rule x.2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel. Finally, the unwieldiness of the long word *samāndākshara* striking his mind, he asks “why such a big name?” and relieves himself by the answer “we say, in order to correspond with the established usage of the Cikshā and other text-books.” The Cikshā as we know it, it may be remarked, does not employ the term.

## द्वे सर्वे द्रुस्वदीर्घे ॥ ३ ॥

3. Two and two, short and long, are similar.

That is to say, as the commentary explains, of these simple vowels, two and two short, two and two long, or a long and a short, are called “similar.” The meaning seems rather to be that, of the three triplets which make up the category of simple vowels, the first two in each triplet, the short and the long, will be designated as “similar”—to the exclusion, namely, of the *pluta* or protracted vowels. The term is used but once in the treatise (namely in x.2, the rule last above quoted), as applied to vowels, and nothing is practically gained by denying its inclusion of the protracted vowels, since these are specially protected from coalescence by the rule x.24. The *r*-vowels are here again shut out, as in the preceding rule; and, in fact, no case occurs in the Vedic text in which two of them are fused into one.

---

3. *teshu<sup>1</sup> samāndākshareshu dvēdve hrasve dvēdve dirghe<sup>2</sup> hrasva-*  
*dirghe<sup>3</sup> dirghahrasve vā'kshare parasparam savarnasamijñe bhava-*  
*taḥ. iyam anvarthasamijñā: savarnatvaṁ nāma sādr̥cyam ucyate:*  
*tasmād akārādinām ikārādibhir na savarnasamijñādgaṇākā bhin-*  
*nasthānaprayatnatvād<sup>4</sup> anayoh. samijñādyāḥ prayojanam: dīrg-*  
*hañ samāndākshare savarnapare (x.2) iti.*  
*hrasvaṁ ca dīrgham ca hrasvadīrghe.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eteshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ins. vā*. <sup>3</sup> B. om.; G. M. *ins. vā*. <sup>4</sup> B. *-tnād*.

The word translated ‘similar’ means literally ‘of identical color’ (i. e. sound), and is several times applied later to identity of consonantal sound. It is, as the commentator points out, a self-explaining term, or one whose application is directly in accordance with its natural meaning (*anvartha*); and hence no suspicion is to be entertained of the inclusion of *a* and *i*, for instance, as “similar,” because of their different mode of organic production. As example of the use of the term is again cited x.2.

## न प्रतपूर्वम् ॥४॥

### 4. Not so, when a protracted vowel precedes.

This is an arbitrary exclusion, made to fit a particular case, which might with more evident propriety have been provided for later, where such cases are under treatment, rather than here in the preliminary definition of terms (compare a somewhat similar case in the Rik Pr., i.1, r. 4). The commentator paraphrases the rule “a simple vowel having a protracted one before it is not termed ‘similar;’” and goes on to cite and explain in full the case to which it applies. In the phrase *āgne: iti: āha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>), the word *āgne* has its final diphthong protracted, and becomes *āgnā̄si*. By the rule (x.2) for the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel, this would then unite with the following word to form *āgnā̄si' ti*. The quality of similarity, however, being denied by the present rule to the final *i*, it is treated as a dissimilar vowel, being first converted into *y* by rule x.15, the *y* dropped by x.19, and the coalescence of the remaining *ā̄s* with the following *i* (as prescribed by x.4) prevented by x.24: thus is assured the reading *āgnā̄s ity āha*.

## पोऽशादितः स्वराः ॥५॥

### 5. The sixteen at the beginning are vowels.

Namely, says the commentator, the sixteen beginning with *a* and ending with *āu*. As example of the use of the technical term

4. *plutapūrvam samānāksharaṇi savarnasāmījñāni na bhavati. plutam asmāt pūrvam iti plutapūrvam. yathā: agnā̄s ity āhe 'ty atra dīrghāñ samānākshare savarnapare* (x.2) *ity ekādeṣah prasaktah: tac ca 'nīṣṭam: pratishiddhyāni tv evāni savarnasāmījñāyām pāriçeshyād ivarṇokārāu yavakārāv* (x.15) *iti pūrvasye 'kārasya yatvāni syāt: sa ca yakāro lupyete tv avarṇapūrvdu yavakārāv* (x.19) *iti lupyate: yakāre huptē sati ivarṇapara ekāram* (x.4) *ity ekārah<sup>2</sup> prasaktah: so pi<sup>3</sup> nishidhyate na plutapragrahāv* (x.24) *ity anena: tasmād agnā̄s ity āhe 'ti prasidhyati<sup>4</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ekādeṣah*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *vi*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *sidhyati*.

*svara*, ‘vowel,’ he quotes the rule (ix.10) prescribing the conversion of *visarjanīya* into *y* before a vowel.

Our Prātiçākhya is to be commended for not including in its list of vowels the long *l*, and for postulating no useless protracted forms of *r* and *l*.

## शेषी व्यञ्जनानि ॥ ६ ॥

### 6. The rest are consonants.

As example of the term *vyanjana*, ‘consonant,’ rule xxi.1, which pronounces the consonant a member of the adjacent vowel, is cited in the commentary, according to the two manuscripts from northern India; those from the south substitute for it the opening rule of the third chapter, and also omit the explanatory statement “beginning with *k* and ending with *svarabhakti*,” which is given by the others.

## आद्याः पञ्चविंशति स्पर्शाः ॥ ७ ॥

### 7. The first twenty-five are mutes.

The commentator explains: “among the consonants, the first twenty-five letters are called mutes” (*sparṣa*, literally ‘contact’). The northern manuscripts add, as under the last rule, “beginning with *k*, and ending with *m*.” It is next pointed out that rules 2 and 5 contain the specification *āditah*, ‘at the beginning,’ and that the different phraseology of this rule, namely *ādyāḥ*, ‘first,’ indicates a difference of meaning: it signifies that the sounds referred to

---

5. *varṇasamāmnāyasyād<sup>1</sup>* "dita drabhyā shodaça varṇāḥ svarasainjñā bhavanti: akārādaya dūkāraparyantā ity arthaḥ. *sainjñāyād<sup>2</sup>* prayojanam: atha svaraparo yakāram (ix.10) ity ādi.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *varṇānām sam-*.

6. *svarebhyaḥ* ḡesho *varṇardāgir* *vyañjanasamījño* *bhavati*: <sup>1</sup>*ka-kārādisvarabhaktiparyantā* ity *ārthah<sup>1</sup>*. *sainjñāyād<sup>2</sup>* *prayojanam*: *vyañjanāñ svarāñgam<sup>2</sup>* (xxi.1) *āti*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *athā "dīv uttare vibhāge krasvām vyañjanapara* (iii.1).

7. *vyañjaneshv* *ādyāḥ* *pañcavīñçativarṇā* *sparçasainjñā bhavanti*: <sup>1</sup>*ka-kārādayo makārāntāḥ*. <sup>2</sup>*sainjñāyād<sup>2</sup>* *prayojanam*: *sparṣa sparçaparah* (xiv.27)<sup>2</sup>. *atha navā* "dītaḥ samā-nāksharāṇi (i.2): *shodaça* "dītaḥ *svardāḥ* (i.5) *itivad ādita* *iti vaktavya* *ādyā* *iti cābdddntaraprayogo* 'rthāntarasūcakah: *vyañjaneshv* *ādyā* *na tu svareshv* *ādyā* *iti vīñeyam<sup>3</sup>*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. remove to end of exposition, and for *sparçaparah* read *sparṣa* ity *ādi*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *jñeyam*.

are first among the consonants, not first among the vowels (better, we should say, not first in the whole list). Of this style of interpretation, which forces a special significance into very innocent variations of phraseology, we shall meet with other and more striking examples farther on.

Rule xiv.27 is given as instance of the employment of the technical term here defined

### पराञ्चतस्त्रो अन्तस्थाः ॥ ८ ॥

8. The next four are semivowels.

The four semivowels are *y*, *r*, *l*, *v*. The rule cited by the commentary in illustration of the use of the term "semivowel" (*antasthā*, i. e. *antah-sthā*, 'standing between, intermediate [between consonant and vowel]': see note to Ath. Pr. i.30) is one (v.28) prescribing the treatment of final *m* before an initial semivowel.

### परे षडुष्माणः ॥ ९ ॥

9. The next six are spirants.

Namely, the three sibilants, *g*, *sh*, and *s*, the *jihvāmūkiya*, *χ*, the *upidhmāniya*, *q*, and the aspiration, *h*. As regards the sounds to which the name *ashman*, 'flatus,' shall be given, the phonetic treatises are greatly at variance. The Vāj. Pr. (viii.22) limits the class to the sibilants and *h*; the Ath. Pr. (see note to i.31) apparently adds the guttural and labial spirants and the more indistinct *visvṛjunīya*; the Rik Pr. (i.2), these and the *anusvāra*. We have an equal right to be surprised at the inclusion of this last in the class, and at the exclusion from it, by our treatise, of the *visvṛjunīya*.

To instance the employment of "spirant," the comment cites the rule (xiv.16) forbidding the duplication of a spirant before a vowel.

### स्पर्शनामानुपूर्वेण पञ्चपञ्च वर्गाः ॥ १० ॥

10. Of the mutes, the successive fives are the series.

The commentary paraphrases: "among the mutes, five and five sounds, in their order, have the designation 'series'; they begin respectively with *k*, *c*, *t*, *t*, *p*, and end with *ñ*, *ñ*, *n*, *n*, *m*." This

---

8. *spurcēbhyaḥ pare catvāro varṇā antasthāsamjnā bhavanti. sajnāyād prayojanam: <sup>1</sup>antasthāparāc ca savarṇam anu-nāśikam* (v.28) *ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> A lacuna in W., extending to the word *prayojanam* in the commentary to the next rule.

9. *antasthābhyaḥ pare shad varṇā ashmasamjnā bhavanti. sajnāyād prayojanam: ashma svaraparah* (xiv.16) *ity ādi.*

exposition is in accordance with the requirements of the context, the treatise being here engaged in defining its technical terms. Otherwise, we might divide *pañca pañcavargāḥ*, and translate, like the corresponding rule in the Rik Pr. (i.2), ‘there are five series, of five each.’

The illustrative rule (xiv.20) cited in the comment teaches the non-duplication of a mute of the lingual series before one of the dental series.

### प्रथमद्वितीयतृतीयतत्त्वात्तमा: ॥ ११ ॥

11. And are called first, second, third, fourth, and last.

Each series of five mutes, that is to say, is composed of a surd, a surd aspirate, a sonant, a sonant aspirate, and a nasal, as *t, th, d, dh, n*; and these classes are named according to their order in the several series. The commentator makes no note here of the physical difference of the classes, but says “In each series, the sounds, in their order, are styled first, second, third, fourth, and last. Even though a name founded on enumeration obviously belongs to them [is assured them, without a special rule to that effect], yet, for the purpose of denying appellation on the ground of any other enumeration, the technical terms ‘first’ and so on are prescribed, to enjoin a certain enumeration.(?) How so? Why, to establish the designation ‘first’ and so on for *k* and its successors alone, and to deny to the vowels, semivowels, spirants, etc., designations founded on their enumeration.” And he proceeds to cite four rules (ii.9; xiv.12, 24; viii.3: but the southern MSS. cite v.38 instead of ii.9) as examples of the use of the five terms defined.

10. *sparśānām madhya āmupārcyena pañcapañca varṇāḥ var-*  
*gasamījñā bhavanti: ka-cu-tu-ta-pāduyo<sup>2</sup> nā-nū-na-na-māntā ity*  
*arthāḥ. samījñāyāḥ prayojanam: tuvargaç cu tāvargaparaḥ* (xiv.20) *ity.<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -pādyāḥ. <sup>3</sup> W. om. the cited rule; G. M. ity adi.

11. *eklīkusmin varge yathākramena<sup>1</sup> varṇāḥ prathamadviti-*  
*yatrītyacaturthottamasamījñā bhavanti: siddhe ‘pi samkhyañi-*  
*mitte nāmanī<sup>2</sup> samkhyañtrānabhidhānārthaṁ<sup>3</sup> samkhyañtarum<sup>4</sup>*  
*kathayitum prathamādisamījñāvidhānam: tat katham: kakārā-*  
*dinām eva<sup>5</sup> prathamādisamījñāpratyayārtham: svārāntustoshma-*  
*prabhṛtishu tatasamkhyañsamījñāpratishedhārtham<sup>6</sup>. samījñāyāḥ*  
*prayojanum: prathamā ashmaparo dvitiyam* (xiv.12):  
*trītyaṁ svaraghoshavatparaḥ* (viii.3): *hakāro hacatur-*  
*theshu* (ii.9): *nū nuttama uttamaparaḥ* (xiv.24): *ity adi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -kramam. <sup>2</sup> G. M. nānni. <sup>3</sup> B. samkhyañtarābh-; G. M. samkhyañbh-.  
<sup>4</sup> M. samījñāntaram: as to the true reading and interpretation of this clause I am by no means confident. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. tu samkh-. <sup>7</sup> G. M. substitute for this rule part of v.38, viz. *prathamapūrvo hakāraç caturtham tasya sasthānam.*

## आप्रावोपाभ्यधिप्रतिपरिविनीत्युपसर्गः ॥ १५ ॥

15. *Ā, pra, ava, upa, abhi, adhi, prati, pari, vi, ni*—these are prepositions.

These ten words are but half the number which are reckoned as prepositions by the Rik and Vāj. Prātiçākhyas (R. Pr. xii.6; V. Pr. vi.24) and by Pāṇini (see the *gana prādayah*). The commentator notes the discordance with Pāṇini, and inquires why the maker of this rule presumably cuts short the list of prepositions with the word *iti* in it. His reply is, that only so many are recognized by the Yajur-Veda. Another objection which he raises and removes, arriving at the comfortable conclusion “therefore there is no discordance whatever,” I do not see the point of. The discordance is a real one, and difficult to explain. The term preposition (*upasarga*) is used in three of the rules of the treatise, viz. vi.4 (which is the cited instance in the commentary), x.9, and xiv.8: for the bearing of the restriction in number, see the notes on those rules.

## वर्णः कारोत्तरो वर्णाख्या ॥ १६ ॥

16. A sound followed by *kāra* is the name of that sound.

That is, for example, *akāra* is the name of *a*, *ekāra* of *e*, and so on. The Vāj. Pr. (i.87) is the only other treatise which takes the trouble to prescribe this usage, common to them all. Our own refers to it also in a later rule (xxii.4). The word *kāra* means ‘making, producing.’ It is in the rules of the Prātiçākhyā added not only to simple alphabetic sounds (*varna*) as their names, but also to syllables like *aḥ* and *an* (see below, rules 23, 58), and the

'15.... ity ete cābdā upasargasamjnā bhavanti. nanu prapārā-  
pasamanvavanirdurvyān ityādi pāniñyā viçeshena bhananti': ka-  
tham atra sūtrakṛtā nīrargalam upasargā iticābdena saṅkucitā  
ucyante. yajurvedavishaya etāvanta eve 'ti mantavyam. tarhi  
prapārāpasam<sup>2</sup> iti samuccaye viçeshapāthah<sup>3</sup> katham upalaθ-  
yate. itiparavāvidhāne tasya tātparyam na tu 'pasargasamjnā-  
vidhāne viçeshapāthah<sup>4</sup>: tasmān na kenacid virodhaḥ. sañjnā-  
ydh prayojanam: upasarganishpūrv o 'nuddatte pade (vi.4).  
itiçabdah prakāravācī.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. and G.p.m. *bhavanti*. <sup>2</sup> B. *prapārāpasam*; G. M. *prāpasam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *viçeshah*; W. *viçeshānīp*. <sup>4</sup> B. -lakṣyate. <sup>5</sup> W. B. *viçeshah p.*

16. *kārottarō varṇo varṇasyā*. <sup>6</sup> *khyā bhavati. yathā: athā i*  
*kārekārāv* (iv.8). *iti*.<sup>1</sup> *kāraçabdā uttarō yasmād asdu kārot-*  
*tarāh*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ity adi*.

commentator very frequently uses it to make names for brief words, like *ca*.

Rule iv.8, respecting *e* and *ī*, is the chosen illustration of the combination here taught.

**अकारव्यवेतो व्यञ्जनानाम् ॥१३॥**

17. But with an *a* interposed, in the case of the consonants.

That is, the name of *k*, for instance, is (*k-a-kāra*) *kakāra*. Compare the equivalent rule, Vāj. Pr. i.38.

The commentator cites rule v.22, respecting the conversion of *t* to *c*.

**न विसर्जनीयजिह्वामूलीयोपध्मानीयानुस्वारनासि-  
व्यानाम् ॥१४॥**

18. Not of *visarjaniya*, *jihvāmūliya*, *upadhmāniya*, *anu-svāra*, and the *nāsikyas*.

The term *nāsikya* designates here, of course, the nasal figments taught in rules xxi. 12-14. All these indistinct, hardly articulate, sounds must be spoken of by their descriptive titles, not by any name founded upon their form. The commentator explains that the appending of *kāra* to the sounds here specified—which would otherwise be regular, since they come under the category of *varna*, ‘alphabetic elements’—is annulled by the rule: adding as a reason, that they are nowhere met with thus treated. He then

17. *akdravyavahito*<sup>1</sup> *varṇah kāraçabdottaro vyājanāndam akhyā bhavati. yathā*: *takāraç cakāram* (v.22) *ity ādi. akārena vyavahito*<sup>2</sup> *kāravyavetaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> W. -*vyaveto*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. put this word after the cited rule. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *vyaveto*.

18. *visarjanīyādīnām varnatvāviceshāt kārottaravam prāptam anena nivartyate: na khalu visarjanīyādīnām kārottaratā bhavati: kutah: sarvatra*<sup>1</sup> *prayogānupalambhāt. nanu yathā varṇah kārottaro varṇākhyā* (i.16) *iti varṇaçabdavācyasyāi* ‘*vākrottaratvam* *nakāro* *nakāram* (vii.1 or xiii.6) *ity ādi: na tu vācakasyāi* ‘*va*<sup>2</sup>’: *anyathā varṇakāra* *iti syāt: tadvād*<sup>3</sup> *visarjanīyādīnām*<sup>4</sup> *atrah* ‘*pi* *vācyagrahanam* *eva yuktam: nd* ‘*nyathā: tathā sati vācakaparataya* *vararucyādīvivracitam*<sup>5</sup> *uddharanam* *avasāne ravisarjanīya* (xiv.15) *ity ādy aruciram: iti cet: māi* ‘*vam mansthāh: vācyāndām*<sup>6</sup> *kevalāndām* *aprayogād* *atra vācyavācakayor abhedarivakshayā* *sūtrasaranir* *ity uddharanaga manikā.*<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *tatha*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. *eva*. <sup>3</sup> W. *tad*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>5</sup> W. B. *vara-rucād*; G. M. *vāraruçād*. <sup>6</sup> W. B. *vācyādīnām*. <sup>7</sup> W. -*nam gam-*.

goes on to raise and refute a very subtle and hair-splitting objection. In rule 16, he says, *kāra* is prescribed to be added not to the vocable (*vācaka*) *varṇa*, 'sound,' itself, but only to the thing designated (*vācya*) by that vocable; so likewise in this rule it is proper to understand by *visarjanīya* etc. the things designated by those words, and nothing else (and hence, the rule must not be interpreted as implying that *visarjanīya* and the other names given are, in default of those formed with *kāra*, the accepted designations for the sounds in question). This being the case, the illustration given under the rule by Vararuci and others—namely, rule xiv.15, speaking of *r* and "visarjanīya" as not liable to duplication—is an unsuitable one. Such is the objection. The reply is: you must not think so; since the sounds designated by the terms in the rule are actually nowhere employed by themselves (as designations), the rule simply intends to include designation and thing designated in one expression; and the quoted example is proper enough.

### १५८ रस्य ॥ १६ ॥

19. Of *r*, however, *epha* forms the name.

That is to say, the technical designation of *r* is *rephā*; *ra* being also admitted, by rule 21, below: *rakāra* is not found anywhere in the Hindu grammatical literature. This peculiarity of treatment of *r*, as compared with the other consonants, is to be paralleled with the way in which it is written in consonant groups, almost as if a vowel.

The Vāj. Pr. has an equivalent rule (i.40).

The word *tu*, 'however,' in this rule, according to the commentator, is meant to deny the application to *r* of both the rules 16 and 17. Some, he says, hold that it denies only rule 17, or the insertion of *a* between *r* and the appended *kāra*: but this is wrong; for it would imply that the name of *r* was made sometimes by appending *kāra* and sometimes by appending *epha*, just as an alternation is in fact allowed by rule 21 below between *ra* and *rephā*, and exemplified by rules vii.11 and xxi.15; while no

---

19. *rasya tv ephaçabda<sup>1</sup> akhyā bhavati. yathā: rephoshma-parah<sup>2</sup> (xlii.2) iti. rephasya vyanjanatvāviçeshat̄ praptam kārot-taratvam akāravyavetvatvam ca: tad ubhayam tuçabdo nivār-yati. anye tv anyathā manyante: akāravyavetvatvam eve 'ti: tad asādhu: taithā sati kaddcid ephottaratd<sup>3</sup> kaddcit kārottaratā ce 'ti vikalpah sydt: yathā 'kāro vyanjanānām (i.21) iti vidhānād vikalpah: taithā hi<sup>4</sup> rephosmasaṁyoge repasvarabhaktih<sup>5</sup> (xxi.15): rashahpūrvohavanī (vii.11) ity ādi: na tv evam kārottaratvam api vikalpena<sup>6</sup> svikrtam<sup>7</sup> kutracit: tasmād asmad-ukta eva yuktas tuçabdārthah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *reph-*; and M. reads *rephas* in the rule itself. <sup>2</sup> W. -shmaçabda. <sup>3</sup> B. *rephakharatād*; W. *reph-*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. 'pi. <sup>5</sup> W. B. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *naka*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. -tah.

instance of a name formed with *kāra* is anywhere to be met with. This is a very easy demolition of a very insignificant man of straw.

### ह्रस्वो वर्णोत्तिरस्त्वयाणाम् ॥२०॥

20. The short vowel, with *varna* after it, is the name of the three vowels.

The “three vowels” referred to are the three quantities—short, long, and protracted—of the vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, respectively; *varna*, in this case, indicating only the ‘color,’ or phonetic complexion, of the vowel, without regard to its length. The Ath. Pr. has the same usage of this term, but without defining it by rule. As our treatise acknowledged no protracted *r*, and neither a long nor a protracted *l*, it does not admit the compounds *rvarna* and *lvarna*: of the other three it frequently avails itself. The instance selected by the commentator is rule x.4, which directs the combination of *a* with a following *i*, *ī*, *īs* into *e*.

### अकारो व्यञ्जनानाम् ॥२१॥

21. An *a* forms the names of consonants.

This rule allows us to call a consonant not only, as prescribed in rules 16 and 17 above, by a name formed by adding *kāra* with *a* interposed, but also by one formed with *a* alone. The commentator’s example is rule v.22, where *t* and *c* are referred to as *ta-kāra*, *cakāra*, and *ç*, *c* again, and *ch*, as *ga*, *ca*, and *cha*. If something merely additional to the *kāra*, instead of alternative with it, were intended in the rule, we are told, rule 1.7 would be made meaningless. But, says an objector, why use *kāra* at all for the purpose, when even along with it the *a* has to be brought into requisition? let this alone furnish the name. The reasonableness of the objection is conceded, but the commentator alleges as sufficient justification of the practice followed, that it is in accordance with that of the Çikshā and other text-books.

He continues: others assert that the *a* added to a consonant indicates (not that consonant pure and simple, but) a syllable composed of the consonant and any following vowel; as for instance in rule ix.3, “*visarjanīya* followed by *ksha* is not assimilated;” where the examples are *manah ksheme* (v.2.1<sup>1</sup>), *ghandghanaḥ kshobhanāḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>: so all the MSS., both here and under ix.3; my MS. of the Sanhitā reads *kshobhaniḥ*), and *ukthaçāsah kshāma* (ii.6.12<sup>4</sup>). This is unsound; for then we should have to read *ishe tvā* (for *ishe tvā*, i.1.1 et al.), by the rule vii.18, “after *vāghā* and *sha*, *t* becomes *t̄*;” which is wrong. Moreover, in the rule (xii

---

20. *varṇottaro hrasvo*<sup>1</sup> *hrasvadīrgaphlutañām akhyā bhavati.*  
*yathā: ivarṇapara ekādram* (x.4) *ity adi. varṇaçabda uttarō yasmād asdu varṇottarah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *traydīpām*.

4) "ya, va, na, ha, when followed by vowels," the final specification would be useless, because already implied in the names given to the letters. Hence the opinion referred to is wrong, and the name taught by the rule indicates the consonant alone.

As for the actual usage of the treatise, it is somewhat equally divided between the two modes of designation of the consonants: names formed with *a* alone occur nearly sixty times; with *akāra*, nearly eighty times. This is exclusive of *r*, which is called *ra* four times, *repha* fifteen times.

Compare rule i.39 of the Vāj. Pr.

## यद्युपास्य च ॥ २२ ॥

22. As also, of a cited word.

The term *grahana* is used in only two other rules of the Prātiśākhya (i.24,50), but occurs in the commentary times innumerable, in the sense of 'citation, word taken or extracted from the Sanhitā to be made the subject of some prescription' (root *grah*, 'seize, take'). The commentator, however, gives it an artificial and false etymology: it denotes, he says, either a word respecting which something is to be enjoined (*lakṣhya*), or one which is the cause (*nimitta*) of an effect produced in some other word. The former is called *grahana* because it is "seized" (i. e. "affected"); the latter, because something is "seized" or "affected" by it. It is, he continues, a part of a word, a theme or base. The *ca*, 'also,' of the rule brings forward, or indicates the continued implication of, the *a* of the preceding rule. The meaning is, then, that *a* forms the name of a citation, a theme, in whatever situation it may occur.

21. *vyanjanānām akāra akhyā bhavati. yathā: takāraç cakārañ' gagachāparah.* (v.22) *ity adi. kāraçabdottarvatvam idān ca vikalpyate: sāmuccaye tv akāravyaveto vyanjanānām* (i. 17) *iti vyartham syāt. nanu tarhi kārottaratā kimartā: taddānīm api svarūpend<sup>4</sup> 'kāralābhāt: sa evā "khyā bhavatu. satyam: cikshādiçāstraprasiddhasamketānusdrene<sup>5</sup> 'ti pariħārah. apare tu saṅgirante: akārah sarvasvardntasya vyanjanasya grāhaka iti: yathā: man---: ghan---: ukth---: ity Adi nākshaparrah* (ix.3) *iti nishedhasyo dāharanām syād iti. tad asāram: kutah<sup>6</sup>: vāghāshapūrvas tash tam* (vii.13) *iti shapūrvatvāt<sup>7</sup> takārasya tātve kṛte iš--- iti syāt: tac cā 'nishtam: kiñ ca: yavanahasvarapareshv<sup>8</sup>* (xii.4) *iti atra svaraparaçabdo vyarthah syāt: bhavanmate sarvasvardntasya<sup>9</sup> svikāraniyamāt: tasmād anupapanānam era<sup>10</sup> tan matam munmahe: kiñ tu varṇamātrasyā "khyā.*

<sup>4</sup> W. B. omit these first two words of the rule. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -*varṇ*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -*tham*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *avyavāyārū-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -*sārāya*. <sup>6</sup> W. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *shatvapū-*

<sup>1</sup> W. *yavanahasvarasvar-*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. -*ntamātrasya*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *evāi*.

That is to say, if a word be cited in the text of a rule by its theme-ending *a*, all its cases or other derivative forms are to be regarded as equally had in view by the rule. Reference is twice made to this principle hereafter by the commentator (under rules vi.13 and x.14), to justify such inclusions. The latter of the cases he here brings up, as example of a *nimitta*, or citation of an affecting cause; the cited word is *oshta*, which is declared to occasion the loss of a preceding *a* or *ā*: the only two instances of this combination which the Sanhitā contains are quoted in illustration, viz. *svāh*" *oshtābhyaṁ* (vii.3.16<sup>1</sup>), and *upayāmam adharen' oshtena* (v.7.12). As example of a *lakṣya*, or citation of a word to be determined by rule, he quotes the end of rule xvi.26, with its illustrative citations, *kiñcilaç caturthaḥ* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>), and *kiñcilda'cakshayañdya ca* (iv.5.9<sup>1</sup>). This latter example is not very well chosen, as the case is a somewhat difficult and anomalous one (see the note on xvi.26).

This rule, like some of those that follow, is of very small value, since final *a* is not the necessary sign of a cited theme in which other cases are included; and, on the other hand, parts of words not ending in *a* are often cited "for the sake of the inclusion of many words" (*bahupāddānartham*).

### अःकार आगमविकारितोपिनाम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. *Ah* makes the name of an increment, or of an element suffering alteration or elision.

Here, again, is a precept hardly called for, as the construction and connection of each rule shows in what way any nominative it contains is to be understood, without such an explanation as this, which applies only to a part of the cases, and is unable to teach us which of the three possibilities it contemplates is the actuality in any given case. Moreover, it is faintly expressed, and the commentator is obliged to explain that *ah* here stands for the ending of the nominative case, in the dual and plural as well as the singular. He quotes in illustration five rules: xiv.5 exemplifies a singular increment; vii.1, a singular altered element; v.19, a singular elision; v.25, two-fold altered elements; xxi.12, plural increments.

---

22. <sup>1</sup>*lakṣyān nīmittān ca grahanām ity ucyate: grhyata<sup>2</sup> iti grahanām: grhyata anene 'ti nīmittām api grahanām: padākadeçāḥ prātipadikam iti yāvat: cakārah pūrvasūtroktam akāram ākarshati: grahanasyu prātipadikasya sarvāvasthasyā 'kdra' akhyā bhavgti. yathā: kiñcila kiñcila (xvi.26) iti parakinçilaçabdo lakṣyām uddharanām: yathā: kiñc cat---: kiñc caksh---: oshtheva h̄paro lupyate (x.14) iti tu<sup>4</sup> nīmittām: yathā: svā---: upay---*

<sup>(1)</sup> W. inserts this passage out of place, between rule 19 and its commentary  
<sup>2</sup> G. *grahanātā*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. omit this example. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om.

Rule 28, below, is very intimately connected with this, and the insertion of rules 25–27 between is quite unaccountable.

Rik. Pr. i.14 includes the second of the three specifications here made, along with rule 28.

## ग्रहणं वा ॥ २४ ॥

### 24. Or the simple citation.

The commentator says: "Of these—namely the increment etc.—there is in some cases, alternatively, citation; the meaning is, without any *ah*." And he goes on to quote three rules, in which increment (xvi.29), alteration (vii.3), and elision (v.15) are taught otherwise than as prescribed in the preceding rule—which is not, however, thus amended into acceptableness.

## आसन्नं संदेहे ॥ २५ ॥

### 25. In case of doubt, citation is made of the next.

This rule, occurring where it does, appears to have been interpolated by an afterthought, attaching itself to the word *grahanam*, 'citation,' of the preceding rule, without regard to the connection in which that word is used. The meaning is, that when the mere citation of a word from the Sanhitâ would leave a doubt as to which occurrence of the word is intended, some part of the context, a word or part of a word, is cited along with it. But the commentator's first example and its exposition are quite peculiar. He quotes *svayamātrāṇām ca vikarnām co 'ttame* (v.3.7<sup>3</sup>), and remarks: "There being a doubt, owing to the occurrence of two *ca*'s in this passage, which of them is to be taken to give the *pragraha*-character [to *uttame*], the one next to the proper subject of the rule [*kāryabhāj*, 'the word undergoing the prescribed

---

23. *āgamādinām ahkāra akhyā bhavati: ahkāra iti prathama-vibhakte upalakṣhanam. āgumasya yathā: 'dvityacatur-thayos tu vyañjanottarayoh pūrvāḥ* (xiv.5): *vikāriṇo yathā: atha nakāro na kāram* (vii.1): *lopino yathā: tish-thantyekaya sapūrvāḥ* (v.19): *ity ekavacanī: lopurā lakāram* (v.25): *iti dvivacanam: ānupūrvyān nāsikyāḥ* (xxi.12): *iti bahuvacanam. āgamaç ca vikāri ca lopi cā "gama-vikāri lopināḥ: teshām.*

<sup>(1)</sup> B. om.

24. *teshām āgamādinām kvacid grahanam vā bhavati: ahkārena vind 'pi 'ti' tātparyam. āgumasya yathā: ādirāñhatir* (xvi.29) *ity adi: vikāriṇo yathā: han yādūpyamānam ca* (vii.3) *ity adi: lopino yathā: eshasasya* (v.15) *ity adi.*

<sup>2</sup> G. M. om. *iti.*

effect'] is to be assumed, in the rule reading *co 'ttame* [iv.11].” He seems to suppose that the “doubt” referred to in the rule concerns the point, which of the two preceding *ca*’s is joined with *uttame* in the precept that establishes the latter’s character as a *pragraha* word, and that we need authority for understanding that the latter of the two is taken. This is little less than silly. His other example is taken from rule iv.15, where *a prshati* is made *pragraha*, the *a* being the final letter of the preceding word *yuñja* (*yuñja prshati*, iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>).

Under a later rule (iv.28) this principle is twice referred to, and very curiously and artificially applied. See the note to that rule.

### अनेकस्यांपे ॥ २६ ॥

#### 26. Even of more than one.

The genitive in this rule is grammatically inconsistent with the accusative of the one preceding, which I had to translate inaccurately in order to make the connection evident. The commentator declares the “even” (*api*) here to continue in force the word *samdehe*, ‘in case of doubt,’ which is hardly to be approved. He interprets: “When there is ambiguity, citation is made of more than one word or sound,” and quotes *tishthanty ekayā* (v.19) and *evo 'ttare* (iv.11) as examples. But in these we have only one additional word cited, though more than one additional letter; so that both are properly examples under the preceding rule. There is no case, I believe, where more than one word requires to be cited along with that at which the rule aims; of a part of a word containing more than one letter we have instances in vi.2,5 etc. I see no good reason, however, why these should not be regarded as authorized by the preceding rule, and this one, accordingly, omitted as superfluous.

### प्रथमो वर्गीत्तरो वर्गात्प्रया ॥ २७ ॥

#### 27. A first mute, followed by the word “series,” is the name of the series.

25. *samdehe saty<sup>1</sup> ḍsannam<sup>2</sup> varnam padam<sup>3</sup> vā gr̄hṇiyat̄: svay---- ity atra cakāradvayasambhavāt pragrahanimittatvena katarasyo 'pādānam kartavyam iti samdehe yad<sup>3</sup> ḍsannam kār-yabhadus tad eva svikartavyam co 'ttame* (iv.11) *iti sūtre<sup>4</sup>. varnasya yathā: a prshati* (iv.15) *ity adi.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *padam* *varnam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *yadā*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. *sarvatra*.

26. *samdeha anekasya pudasya varnasya vā grahanam bha-vati: apigabdhā samdeha ity anvādiçati<sup>1</sup>. yathā<sup>2</sup>: tishthanty ekayā sapūrvah* (v.19): *evo 'ttare* (iv.11) *ity adi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *adisati*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. om.

The commentator's example is rule xiv.20, "the *t*-series, followed by the *t*-series;" that is to say, a lingual mute followed by a dental. Compare Vāj. Pr. i.64.

### अं विकारस्थ ॥ २८ ॥

28. *Am* makes the name of a product of alteration.

This is the correlative rule to 23, above, from which it has become strangely separated. The commentator explains, as before, that *am* stands here as representative of the accusative case in any number; but the two examples he gives (v.38 and vii.1) are both of them such as the rule might strictly apply to without any such extension of its meaning.

### पूर्वं इति पूर्वः ॥ २९ ॥

29. By preceding is meant preceding.

A rule expressed in the form of an identical proposition cannot be claimed to cast much light of itself, but demands a comment as its essential part. Our commentator explains: "Whatever word is pointed out by the qualification 'preceding,' that word is to be understood as designated by its own form in that situation alone; but not, on account of identity of form, another word standing in a different situation. Thus, by the rules (iv.12,13) 'dyāvāprthivi' is *pragraha*; also the preceding word, the word *yāvati* is made a *pragraha* in the passage *yāvati dyāvāprthivi mahitvā* (iii.2.6<sup>1</sup>); but it is not therefore *pragraha* in the passage *yāvati vāi prthivi* (v.2.3<sup>1</sup>)."

### परं इत्युत्तरः ॥ ३० ॥

30. By following is meant succeeding.

27. *vargaçabdottarah prathamah evavargasyā<sup>1</sup> "khyā bhavati: tavaragaç ca tavargaparāh* (xiv.20) *iti. vargaçabda uttaro yasmād asāu vargottarah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. *sva.*

28. *am iti çabdo vikdrasyā<sup>2</sup> "khyā bhavati: am iti dvitīyāvi-bhakter upalakshānam. yathā: prathamapūrvo hakāraç caturtham* (v.38) *: atha nakāro ṣakāram* (vii.1).

29. *yāh pūrvaçabdena nirdishṭāh<sup>3</sup> sa tatrāi 'va svena rūpeno 'palakshito jñātavyāh: na tu rāpasāmānyād anyo bhinnadeca-sthāh. yathā<sup>4</sup>: dyāvāprthivi<sup>5</sup>: pūrvaç ca (iv.12,13) iti<sup>6</sup> pragraho bhavati<sup>7</sup> 'ti vakṣyati: pūrvatvād yāv---- iti yāvatiçab-dah pragrahāh: yāv---- iti tu<sup>8</sup> na syāt pragrahāh.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *viçhyate.* <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*vishyati.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. *atra.*

This is the counterpart of the preceding rule, and is explained by the commentator in corresponding terms. His illustration is taken from rules iv.49,50, where *dve* and the word following it are declared *pragraha*. In the passage, then, *dve jāye vindate* (vi.6.4<sup>3</sup>), *jāye* is *pragraha*, but not in the passage *yonir asi jāya e 'hi* (i.7.9<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *e 'hi*).

The rule is only once referred to hereafter, namely under iv.52; and there for a purpose which it was not intended to answer.

## अकारलक्षारौ ऋस्वौ ॥ ३१ ॥

31. *R* and *l* are short.

As examples of short *r* and *l*, the commentator cites *ṛtavo vāi* (vii.2.6<sup>1</sup>), and *aklptasya klptyāi* (v.4.8<sup>5</sup>).

## अकारश्च ॥ ३२ ॥

32. Also *a*.

“Also” (*ca*), says the commentator, brings forward the implication of “short” from the preceding rule. His example of short *a* is *ayam purāḥ* (iv.3.2<sup>1</sup> or 4.3<sup>1</sup>).

## तेन च समानकालस्वरः ॥ ३३ ॥

33. Also any vowel having the same quantity with the latter.

Here again, the “also” continues the implication of the predicate of rule 31, we are told. The only vowels contemplated by the rule, further, are *i* and *u*, since there is an absence of the attribute of like quantity with *a* in the diphthongs. As examples from the Sanhitā are quoted *ishe tvā* (i.1.1 et al.), *upaprayanto udhvaram* (i.5.5<sup>1</sup> or 7<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit *adhvaram*), and *atrad "ha tad urugayasya* (i.3.6<sup>2</sup>: but see the various readings below). The commentator then raises the objection (without introducing it, as usual,

30. *yāḥ para ity anena viçishyate so 'pi tatrāi 'va svena rūpena pratyetavyāḥ. yathāः dve: paraś ca* (iv.49,50) *iti' pragraho bhavatī 'ti vakshyati: paratvād dve jā--- ity atra jāye iti<sup>2</sup> pragrahah: <sup>3</sup>yo--- ity atra <sup>4</sup> na pragrahah<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *cabdah*. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *tu*.

31. *ṛkāraç ca lkāraç ca hrasvasamjñādu bhavataḥ. yathāः rt---: ak---*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om.

32. *akāraç ca hrasvasamjñō bhavati: cakāro hrasvatvam<sup>1</sup> anvādicati. yathāः ay--- iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -svam.

with *nanu*), that the matter of the three rules should have been put into this form: “*A* is short: also any vowel having like quantity with it;” because, as actually stated, they are liable to the reproach of saying the same thing over twice (since *r* and *l* are of the same quantity as *a*, and are therefore included in the prescription of the present rule). But he replies that the statement is right in its present shape; for *r* and *l* inhere in *r* and *l*; and one might therefore suppose that, being letters of more than one articulating position, they suffered an extension of quantity, and were not short: hence the special rule concerning them. The treatise, as was noticed above (under 1.2), nowhere describes the formation of *r* and *l*, though it excludes them from the category of simple vowels.

The rule of the Vâj. Pr. (i.55) is nearly the same with this.

### अनुस्वारश्च ॥३४॥

#### 34. Also *anusvâra*.

The implication being the same as in the preceding rules, *anusvâra* is here defined as having the quantity of a short vowel. The commentator explains the occasion for the rule as follows: rule xxi.6, which teaches that *anusvâra* and *svarabhakti* are to be attached to the preceding vowel in syllabication, implies the consonantal character of the former; whence, by rule 37, below, it would have the quantity of a half-mora, and its true quantity of a mora requires special definition.

The Vâj. Pr. (iv.147,148) allows *anusvâra* to make with a preceding vowel, either long or short, two moras, oddly enough distributing the time between the two elements, vowel and nasal, in such a way that the latter has a mora and a half after a short vowel, the vowel being itself shortened to a half-mora, while after a long vowel the nasal is itself cut down to a half-mora, and a mora and a half are assigned to the vowel—a highly artificial ar-

33. tend' kârena yas tulyakâlah svarah sa ca hrasvo bhavati: atrâ<sup>1</sup> pi cakâro hrasvâdeçakah<sup>2</sup>: ikâra ukâraq ce<sup>3</sup> 'ty arthah: samâdhyaksharânâm samânakdlatvâbhâvât<sup>4</sup>. yathâ<sup>5</sup>: ish----: up----: utr----<sup>6</sup> akâro hrasvas tena ca samânakâlasvara ity ârabdhavyam: rkâralkârâu hrasvâv iti tu<sup>7</sup> nâ "rabdhavyam: evâm ârabhyamâne punaruktatayâ gâuravam bhaved iti. ucyate: ârabdhavyam evâi 'tat: kutah: rkâralkârayor antarâ<sup>8</sup> rephalakârâu stah: tattatsthânatvâd<sup>9</sup> anayoh kâlavabyâhicârah syât: hrasvatvâm na<sup>10</sup> gamyeta<sup>11</sup>: tan mâ bhûd ity evam ârabhyate: rkâralkârâv<sup>12</sup> iti.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. tatrad. <sup>2</sup> G. M. hrasvatvâdeçakah samânakâla svara iti. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -kilasvaratvâ-. <sup>5</sup> W. om. <sup>6</sup> B. atrâ "ha only; G. M. atra hy; both as if the introduction to what follows. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. anantare. <sup>9</sup> G. M. tatsth-. <sup>10</sup> B. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. avagamyate. <sup>12</sup> G. M. ins. hrasvâu.

rangement. The Rik Pr. gives no special statement respecting the quantity of the nasal element, but leaves it to be included among the other consonants, which have half a mora of time each.

All the "short" elements being now enumerated, the commentator quotes, as example of the employment of the term "short," rule iii.1. As example of *anusvāra*, he quotes *tāñ haste* (vi.1.37).

## दिस्तावान्दीर्घः ॥३५॥

35. An element of twice that quantity is long.

The literal meaning of this rule is, says the commentator, that one of the before-mentioned short vowels, when doubled, is long: but its virtual intent is that a vowel having twice the quantity of a short is long. I have translated in accordance with the latter interpretation. As example of the use of the term "long" is quoted rule x.2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel.

## त्रिः सुतः ॥३६॥

36. An element of three times that quantity is protracted.

The commentator explains the virtual meaning of this rule in the same manner as that of the preceding, and quotes in illustra-

34. *bhavaty anusvāraç ca<sup>1</sup> hrasvasamjñāḥ. yathā: tāñ... cakāro hrasvāñkarshakāḥ<sup>2</sup>: anusvāraḥ svarabhaktiç ca (xxi.6) iti svarapratyāñgatvavidhānād<sup>3</sup> anusvārasya vyanjanatvam: tathā sati hrasvārdhakālam vyanjanam (i.37) ity atrā<sup>4</sup> 'rdhamātratvam<sup>5</sup> praptam<sup>6</sup>: tan mā bhūd iti hrasvatvam vidhiyate. hrasvasamjñāyāḥ prayojanam: vibhāge hrasvam vyanjanaparaḥ (iii.1) iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *api*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *hrasvāk-*. <sup>3</sup> MSS. *svaraṁ pr-*; W. -ngavidh-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *om.*  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. *-tve*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-te*.

35. *tāvān iti prakrito hrasva ucyate: dvir iti dvirdpah<sup>1</sup>: tāvān hrasvo dīrghasamjñō bhavati<sup>2</sup> 'ti sūtrayojanā: tātparyam tu hrasvadīrgunākālāḥ<sup>3</sup>. svaro dīrghasamjñō bhavati<sup>4</sup> 'ti.<sup>5</sup> samjñādyāḥ prayojanam: dīrghāñ samānākshare savarṇapare (x.2) ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *pam*. <sup>2</sup> W. inserts here, out of place, *samjñādyāḥ prayojanam*. <sup>3</sup> B. *-la*; W. *om. laḥ*. <sup>4</sup> W. *om. iti*.

36. *atrā<sup>1</sup> pi<sup>2</sup> hrasvo 'nuvariate sāmnidhyāt: trir iti trirupah<sup>3</sup>: trirupō hrasvah plutasamjñō bhavati 'ti: tātparyam tu atrā<sup>4</sup> 'pi brāmāḥ: hrasvatrigunākālāḥ svaraḥ plutasamjñō bhavati<sup>5</sup>. samjñādyāḥ prayojanam: na plutapragrahāv (x.24) iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ins. sa*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. *om.*

tion of the term “protracted” rule x.24, which directs that a protracted and a *pragraha* vowel are not liable to combination.

All the treatises agree closely in their definitions of vowel quantity; see Ath. Pr. i.59–62, and the notes upon those rules.

## ह्रस्वाधकालं व्यञ्जनम् ॥ ३७ ॥

37. A consonant has half the quantity of a short vowel.

This, the comment reminds us, is a rule defining the length of a consonant, not one giving the meaning of the term consonant. For, if it were the latter, the word “time” in rule xvii.5, which speaks of “the time of a consonant,” would be open to the charge of redundancy. We hardly need so trifling and technical a proof of a thing so obvious. As example of a consonant, the word *vāk* (e. g. i.3.9<sup>1</sup>: but G. M. read instead *vōk*) is given us.

Of the other treatises, the Ath. Pr. (i.60) alone differs from this by giving to a consonant a whole mora as its quantity.

## उच्चिरुदातः ॥ ३८ ॥

38. A syllable uttered in a high tone is acute.

The commentator enters into no explanation of the meaning of the definition of the acute tone or accent here given, but simply refers us to a later rule (xxii.9), where the action of the organs in producing the higher tone is more particularly described. He adds as example of an acute vowel *sá idhānāḥ* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>: but all the MSS. save W. read *sá iṭī*), and quotes rule xiv.29 as exemplifying the use of the term *uddatta*, ‘acute’ (literally ‘elevated’). I have explained in the note to Ath. Pr. i.14–16 why I prefer, instead of transferring the terms *uddatta*, *anuddatta*, and *svarita*, to translate them by ‘acute,’ ‘grave,’ and ‘circumflex,’ respectively.

## नीचिरुदातः ॥ ३९ ॥

39. In a low tone, grave.

37. *vyañjanam hrasvārdhakdlam bhavati: na tu vyañjanam iti samjñā: anyathā<sup>1</sup> vyañjanakdlaç ca svarasyā 'trā 'dhikāḥ<sup>2</sup>* (xvii.5) *iti.<sup>3</sup> kālaçabdasya pdunaruptydpatteh. yathā: vāk. hrasvasyā 'rdho<sup>4</sup> hrasvārdhāḥ<sup>5</sup>: 'hrasvārdhakālāḥ<sup>6</sup> parimānam yasyā<sup>7</sup> tat tatho 'ktam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. omit the last two words of the rule. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *atra*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -dham. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *hrasvārdham kālāḥ parimānakdlo yasya*—a good and consistent reading; B. is corrupt. <sup>6</sup> W. -lam.

38. *dyāmo dāruṇyam* (xxii.9) *iti lakshanalakshitah<sup>1</sup> svara udatta ucyate. yathā: sá..... samjñāyāḥ prayojanam: udattat paro 'nudattah svaritam* (xiv.29) *iti.<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -ta. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ity addi.

We are again referred to the rule in one of the last chapters (xxii.10) which defines the action of the organs in producing the lower tone. The example for the accent is *avadatām* (i.7.2<sup>2</sup>: but G. M. read *avaddatām*), of which, in *pada*-text, all the syllables are grave; that for the term *anudditta*, ‘grave’ (literally, ‘not elevated’), is, in W. B., rule iv.43; but in G. M., rule xiv.29.

## समाहारः स्वरितः ॥४०॥

40. Their combination is circumflex.

The commentator explains *samādhāra*, ‘combination,’ as from *samāhriyate*, ‘it is taken together, collected, combined;’ and adds, “the accent arising from the mixing of those two is the circumflex (*svarita*). This is a precept concerning the peculiar nature of the accent; its occurrence is taught further on, in one and another place;” and he quotes not less than three of the rules (xiv.29, x.16, and xii.9) which teach under what circumstances the circumflex arises. His example of a circumflexed syllable is *tē ‘brīvān* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup> et al.).

This rule is so far ambiguous that it does not tell us in what order the acute and grave tones are to be combined to produce the circumflex accent—whether acute and grave, or grave and acute; but we may perhaps assume that the treatise consciously intends them to be taken in the order in which they are defined by the two preceding rules.

All the authorities practically agree in their general definition of the three kinds of accent (see note to Ath. Pr. i.14–16); and Pāṇini’s rules (i.2.29–31) are precisely the same with those here given. As regards the details which form the subject of the following rules of our treatise, the accordance is not so perfect (see note to Ath. Pr. i.17).

## तस्यादिरुचैस्तरामुदातादनत्तरे यावदर्धं द्रस्वस्य ॥४१॥

41. Of this circumflex, in case it immediately follows an

---

39. *anv avasargah* (xxii.10) *iti*<sup>1</sup> *sūtralakṣhitāḥ*<sup>2</sup> *svaro ‘nu-*  
*datta ucyate*<sup>3</sup>. *yathā : av-* *samjñāyāḥ prayojanam :* *anuddatto*  
*na nityam* (iv.43) *iti*<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -ta. <sup>3</sup> B. *lakṣhyate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. give xiv.29, and *ity ādi*.

40. *taylor uddttānudāttayor yah samāhāraḥ sa<sup>1</sup> svarita ucyate.*  
*yathā ; tē----- samāhriyata iti samāhāraḥ : taylor melācjan-*  
*yasvarāḥ<sup>2</sup> svarita<sup>3</sup> ity arthāḥ. svaritasvarūpavidhir ayam :* *uparishṭāt tu ‘tatratatra svarito lakṣhyate*<sup>4</sup>; *yathā : udāttat paro*  
*‘nudāttāḥ svaritam* (xiv.29); *udāttayog ca paro ‘nudāttāḥ*  
*svaritam* (x.16); *tasminn<sup>5</sup> anudātte<sup>6</sup> pūrva udāttāḥ*  
*svaritam* (xii.9) *ity ādi*.

<sup>1</sup> M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. -ra: B. -nyāḥ *svara*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *vak-*. <sup>5</sup> W. om.  
<sup>6</sup> W. *tannudāttē*.

acute, the first part, to the extent of half a short vowel, is uttered in a yet higher tone.

That is, higher than the tone of acute, which properly forms its first element; one is tempted to give the word *uddāttāt* a double construction, as belonging in idea to *uccdistarām* as well as to *anantare*.

The subject of the more particular definition of the circumflex accent occupies the six following rules, and any comments upon the doctrines laid down will be better reserved until the last rule.

As example of the circumflex, the commentator cites the words *sá idhānāh* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>), already once given (under rule 38); the first syllable of the second word has the enclitic circumflex, by rule xiv.29, under which the same quotation is repeated.

### उदात्तसमः शेषः ॥४२॥

42. The remainder has the same tone with acute.

The plain meaning of this rule is distorted by the commentator, in an attempt to avoid a seeming inconsistency. He claims, namely, that the word "same with" here signifies "a trifle lower than," "because otherwise there would be no circumflex"—the circumflex having been defined in rule 40 as including both the higher and lower tone. But the inconsistency is not evaded by claiming for the last portion of the circumflex any thing short of the actual "grave" tone which rule 40 prescribes: if, indeed, giving to its first portion a higher tone than "acute" be not an equal offense against the same rule.

### सव्यञ्जनो अपि ॥४३॥

43. Along with the consonant, too.

Says the commentator—"the rule as formerly given applied to a pure vowel; now the same thing is taught of the circumflexed vowel even in case of its combination with a consonant. The circumflexed vowel along with its consonant, either the one which directly follows an acute or another, is as defined. The 'too' (*api*) continues the implication of the circumflexed vowel." To this explanation of *api*, as simply equivalent with *ca*, we must demur. As any one may see by referring to the various rules in

---

41. *udāttād anantare yah svaraḥ svaryate tasyā "dis tāvad uccdistarām udāttatāro bhavati yāvad dhrasvusyā 'rdham. ya-thā: sā.....*

42. *hrasvārdhakālāc chesha udāttasamo bhavati: 'na tā 'dāttā eva: samācabdaprayogāt kīmcin nyānatvam pratyaye': anyathā svaritābhāvāt. pūrvoktam evo 'dāharanam.*

<sup>(1)</sup> W. repeats these clauses in the comment of the preceding rule, after *bhavati*.

which it occurs, it is always best translated by ‘even,’ as pointing out something which is to a certain degree anomalous, or not to have been naturally expected.

As examples of circumflexed syllables containing consonants, the commentary offers sákhā sákhibhyo várivah krnotu (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>: all the MSS. except W. give only the second and third words, which are the ones to which the rule applies; the second syllab of each has the enclitic *svarita*, and they are to be read and divided sá-khīb-bhyo vár-i-vah), and tishydh (ii.2.10<sup>2</sup> et al.: but G. M. omit this example).

I have not observed that any other of the treatises deems it necessary to lay down in terms the principle that the consonant shares in the accentuation of the vowel to which it is attached. Though the rule may be regarded as in a manner superfluous, it is less to be objected to in itself than on account of the place where it is thrust in, so wholly out of connection. It ought to be somewhere where it can be made to apply to all the three accents, and not to the circumflex alone.

## अनतरो वा नीचिस्तराम् ॥४४॥

44. Or the part following is uttered in a lower tone.

The comment explains *anantara* in this rule as equivalent to *yesha* (in rule 42), and paraphrases by saying that “the remainder of this circumflexed syllable, after the half-mora [of which the character was defined in rule 41] is in a lower tone; that is, is *anuddattatara* (‘lower than grave’).” Whether this is the true meaning, and not rather that the last part of the syllable, instead of being “of the same tone with acute” (rule 42), is “of lower tone (than acute),” may well be made a question. It would be, I should think, an exaggeration of the circumflex of which hardly any theorist would be guilty, to begin it higher than acute, and end it lower than grave. The latter of the two interpretations suggested is also (though not unequivocally) supported by the next rule, which may most naturally be regarded as letting down the concluding tone of the syllable one degree farther than the present rule, as this than the preceding.

---

43. kevalasyā 'yam vidhiḥ purastād uktah: idānīm vyanjanasahitative 'pi 'svaritasya tathātvam ucyate: 'savyañjano 'pi' svarita 'uddattād anantaro<sup>1</sup> 'nyo 'vo 'ktavidhir<sup>2</sup> bhavati: api-  
cabdah<sup>3</sup> 'svaritam dkarshati<sup>4</sup>. yathā: sakha-----: ti-

<sup>(1)</sup> W. om. <sup>(2)</sup> W. -tānanti-. <sup>(3)</sup> W. vd mukhyā vi-. <sup>(4)</sup> B. qm. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. -dkarshakah.

44. tasya svaritasya hrasvārdhakālāc chesho nīcāstardam anuddattatara<sup>1</sup> bhavati: anantarah gesha ity arthah: tad evo dāharanam.

<sup>1</sup> W. -dātaro.

अनुदात्तसमो वा ॥४५॥

45. Or in the same tone with grave.

The commentator does not attempt this time, as under rule 42, to show that "same" means in reality "a little different," but simply paraphrases (taking no account of the *vā*, 'or'): "That same remainder of this circumflexed syllable is the same with *anudātta*."

आदिरस्योदात्तसमः शेषो अनुदात्तसम इत्याचार्याः ॥४६॥

46. Its beginning is the same with acute; its remainder is the same with grave: so say the teachers.

Or, it may be, 'so says the teacher,' the plural being used in token of respect: the word *acārya* is not elsewhere found in the treatise (save at xxiv.6) except in the expression *ekeshdm acāryāñam*, 'of certain teachers,' which occurs several times. The commentator does not give us his opinion upon the point, but he declares this to be the only rule that is approved or of force (*ishta*, literally 'desired') in the net-work (*jala*) of alternative views here adduced, commencing with rule 41. It may, in fact, be looked upon as identical in meaning with the fundamental rule 40, and as presenting the only reasonable and sensible view of the true character belonging to the circumflex accent. The elaboration of the theory of the circumflex, the classification of its varieties, and the determination of their relations to one another, appear to have been quite a favorite weakness with the Hindu phonetists. The subject occupies the whole of one of the later chapters of this treatise (xx.), together with sundry rules in other chapters; and a more detailed examination of it, and criticism of the views taken respecting it, will be necessary in connection with some of those rules.

While approving this rule, for the reason that it is in accordance with the last two rules of chapter xx., which define the relation of

45. *tasya<sup>1</sup> svaritasya sa eva gesha anudāttasamo bhavati.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

46. *tasyā'va svaritasyā "dihrasvārdhakāla udāttasamo bha-vati: 'geshas tv anudāttasamo bhavati': geshas tv anudāttasamu-  
ity acāryā bruvate. yathā: sakha---- tasyā "dir (i.41) ity  
adyabhyāhite<sup>2</sup> 'smīn vikulapajālē<sup>3</sup> sūtram etad eṣe 'śṭam: pra-  
cīshṭaprātihatuyor mṛdutarāḥ (xx.11): tāirovyanjanapa-  
ddavṛttayor (xx.12) iti lakṣhanāmukhālyāt: na tu 'paritanam  
api sūtram iṣṭam: etallakṣhaiṣaprātihād eva.*

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. omit, which is better. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ārabhyā 'bhīhitē; B. abhyahita (?—cor-  
rupt). <sup>3</sup> W. B. -ipyā- (ypa?); W. jāte.

four of the kinds of circumflex to one another in respect to hardness of utterance, the commentator rejects in advance the next following rule, as being discordant with them. The ground of the asserted accordance and discordance I am not able to discover.

### सर्वः प्रवण इत्येके ॥४७॥

47. It is all a slide, say some.

The commentator says: "The word 'slide' (*pravana*) is a synonym of 'circumflex:' the circumflexed vowel, along with its consonants, starting from its beginning, is all of it a slide: so some teachers have said." And he adds the same example already more than once given, *sákhibhyo váriváḥ* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>). We have seen that, in his exposition of the preceding precept, he has rejected this one, upon grounds of inappreciable value. The view here taken is one that might well enough be held by any one, as virtually equivalent with the one before presented: the voice somehow makes its descent from the higher to the lower pitch within the compass of the accented syllable; whether by a leap or a slide, is a proper theme for hair-splitting argumentation, but of the smallest practical consequence.

### नानापदविदिंग्यमसंख्याने ॥४८॥

48. A separable word is treated like separate words, except in an enumeration.

The meaning and application of this precept may be best exhibited by means of the examples which the commentator quotes. We have a rule (iv.40) that *te* and *the* at the end of a word of more than two syllables are *pragraha* if preceded by *a* or *e*. In the passages *oshatāt tigmahete* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>) and *tat praváte* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>), then, the final syllables would be *pragraha*, but that the words in which they occur are separable compounds, written in the *pada*-text *tig-ma-hete* and *pra-váte*, and so are exempted by this rule from the

47. *pravaṇaçabdah<sup>1</sup> svaritaparyāyah: savyañjana eva svarita  
ādita ārabhya sarvah pravano bhavati 'ty eka<sup>2</sup> ācāryā uciare.  
yathā: sakha<sup>3</sup> ----.*

<sup>1</sup> B. has *pravana* for *pravāna* everywhere. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> M. *sarvebhyo*.

48. *iñgypadam nānāpadavad bhavati: asaṅkhyānavishaye:  
nānāpadavad iti kim: osh----: tat---- ity addv akāraikā-  
rapūrvas tu bahusvarasya te the (iv.40) ity atra<sup>2</sup> pragra-  
hatvam mā bhād iti: asaṅkhyāna iti kim: dve: paraç ca:  
ekavyaveto pi (iv.49-51): <sup>3</sup> dve sav---- ity atra pragraha-  
tvam bhavatu<sup>4</sup> iti vadāmāḥ. nānāpadam iva nānāpadavat.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -ne vish-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. iti. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *prabhavatu*.

operation of iv.40: the *te* is in each case the ending of a dissyllabic word. What is meant by “enumeration” is not, in itself, very clear, as the case already cited is, in a certain sense, one of enumeration—namely, of the syllables of a word. The commentator shows its intent by pointing out that, by rules iv.49–51, the word *dve*, the next word to it, and the next but one, are made *pragraha*: hence, in the passage *dve savane śukravatī* (vi.1.6<sup>4</sup>), *śukravatī* (*pada-text śukra-vatī*) must be counted as a single word only, or the *i* of *vatī* would not be *pragraha*.

In this, as in the Rik and Atharva Prātiçākhyas, the word *īngya* T. W. B. and O. more usually write *īngya*, or *īnya*) means a compound word, treated as separable into its constituents in the *pada*-text. The St. Petersburg lexicon erroneously explains it as signifying a single member of such a compound.

Compare Rik Pr. i.25, and Vāj. Pr. i.153.

### तस्य पूर्वपदमवग्रहः ॥४६॥

49. Of such a word, the former member is called *avagraha*.

The example quoted is *devyata iti deva-yate* (iii.5.5<sup>3</sup>)—an instance of *cared*, or repetition with *iti* interposed, such as is usual in the *krama*-texts, and, to a certain extent, in the *pada*-texts also. The existing *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan would write this word simply *deva-yate*, reserving the repetition with *iti* for words which are *pragraha* and separable at the same time: but that of the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā treats all separable compounds in the latter method (see, for the varying usages of different texts, the note to Ath. Pr. iv.74). In *deva-yate*, the part *deva* is denominated *avagraha*. As instance of the use of this technical term is given the rule (iv.2) which exempts all first members of compounds from the action of the rules prescribing *pragraha*.

The commentator, finally, calls attention to the mutual relation, or apposition, of the words *pada* and *avagraha* in the rule, each in its own gender (the former being neuter, the latter masculine): compare under ii.7 and v.2.

The other Prātiçākhyas use the term *avagraha* in this sense, but without taking the trouble to define it.

### पदग्रहणेषु पदं गम्येत ॥५०॥

50. In citations of a word, that word is to be understood.

That is to say, the cited word itself, and not a part of a word

---

49. <sup>1</sup>*tasye 'n̄gypadasya pūrvapadam avagraha<sup>1</sup> ity ucyate. yathā: dev----- avagrahasamjñdydh<sup>2</sup> prayojanam: nā 'vagrahah* (iv.2) *ity ādi. padāvagrahaśabdāyor niyatānīgatvānyonyānvayāh<sup>3</sup> sambhavati.*

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. om. *avagraha*. <sup>(3)</sup> W. *niyama-*.

identical in form with it. Thus (to take the commentator's example), *tve* is later (iv.10) declared *pragraha* except at the end of a separable word, as in the passage *tve kratum* (iii.5.10<sup>1</sup>); the exception specified is necessary, because the *tve* of a word like *aditi-tve* (p. *aditi-tve*) is also a *pada* or vocable;—but it is not therefore to be inferred that the *tve* of *kratve*, in the passage *kratve dakshāya* (iii.2.5<sup>2</sup>; 3.11<sup>4</sup>), is also *pragraha*.

As the commentator had formerly derived *grahanam* (i.22) from *grhyate*, so now he derives *grahanāni* from *grhṇanti*, 'they seize, take.'

The principle here taught is appealed to several times (under iv. 11,38; vii.2) hereafter, in order to the settlement of doubtful points.

It would seem possible to be still made a question whether the citation in any particular rule were a *pada*, 'a full word,' or a *padākadeca*, 'part of a word,' since citations of the latter kind are also frequently made. Perhaps the commentator would settle the difficulty by asserting that no combination of articulate sounds which actually occurs in the Sanhitā as a *pada* is ever cited in any other character.

## अपि विकृतम् ॥ ५१ ॥

51. But that word, even when phonetically altered.

The commentator gives two examples. The word *vāhana*, he says, is cited later (vii.6) as one whose *n* is liable to conversion into *n̄*: this conversion, then, still holds good, though the final syllable of the word have become *o*: thus, *pravāhanō vahnīḥ* (i.3.3). Again, *syah*, by v.15, loses its final *visarga*; and it does so, even when its *s* is changed to *sh*, as in *ayam u shya pra devayuh* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>). As regards the former of these examples, it might seem to be provided for by rule i.22, above: but the commentator would doubtless plead that the rule would apply to *vāhanāḥ*, but not to *vāhanō*.

---

50. *padagrahaneshu sūtreshu grhātam padam eva gamyeta*:<sup>1</sup> *jñātavyam: na padākadecaḥ*<sup>2</sup>. *yathā: tve ity anīgryāntah*<sup>3</sup> (iv.10) *iti vakshyati: tathā sati tve.... iti pragraho bhavati: kra.... iti padākadecaḥ na bhavati. grhṇantī 'ti grahanāni: padānām grahanāni padagrahanāni: teshu.*

<sup>1</sup> M. ins. *tad*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*saṁ*. <sup>3</sup> W. *anīgny-*; B. *anīgny-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*catvān*.

51. *apiçabdah padam anvādicati: padagrahaneshu vikrtam api padam avagantavyam. yathā: natvāpattīv vāhana* (vii.6) *iti grahishyate: padam iti kṛtvā visarjanīya otvam āpanne 'pi natvam nāi 'va nivartate: pra----: eshasasyah* (v.15) *iti visarjanīyalopagrahanam pathishyate: ay---- ity atra sakute shatvam āpanne<sup>1</sup> visargalopo bhavaty eva.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *'pi*.

## अन्यकारादि ॥५२॥

52. And even when preceded by *a*.

The evident occasion of this rule is the frequent occurrence of words with the negative prefix *a* attached to them. But, it being once established, its sphere is not restricted to that class of compounds, as is shown in the very example chosen by the commentator to illustrate its working. By iii.2, *gvā* is included among the words whose final *ā* is liable to be shortened; then, by this rule, *agvā* is also included: e. g. *agvādvantañ* (p. *agva-vantam*) *sahasrinām* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>).

Application of this principle is quite frequently made below (under iii.2,8; v.13,16; vi.5,14; viii.8,13; xi.16; xvi.6,19).

## अन्कारादि च ॥५३॥

53. And when preceded by *an*.

The origin and aim of this rule are obviously the same with those of the preceding, but the instances of its application are less frequent: it is appealed to but three times in the sequel (under rules iii.7,viii.8, and xvi.29). The last case is the one selected by the commentator as his example. The word *añçu*, by xvi.29, contains *anusvāra*; hence the same word preceded by *an* is to be regarded as included with it, as in the passage *anañçu kurvantah* (iii.2.2<sup>1</sup>).

The commentator now raises the question: how comes *kāra* to

---

52. atrā 'py apiçabdhā padāñvādeçakah: padagrahañeshv akārādy<sup>1</sup> api<sup>2</sup> padam vijñeyam: 'gvartāvayund (iii.2) iti hrasvādege vakshyati: akārāder api tasya grahañasyu hrusavatvam bhavati. yathā: a gv-..... akāra ādir yasya tat tathoktam.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -dīp. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ca. <sup>3</sup> G. M. prefixes the preceding three words of the cited rule.

53. cakārah padam iti bodhayati: padagrahañeshv ankārāddy api padam vijñeyam: añçu (xvi.29) ity anusvārāgame vakshyati: ankārāder api tasyā 'nusvārāgamaḥ sydt. yathā: an-.... ankāra ādir yasya tat tathoktam.

nanv atra sātre 'n ity asya kārottaravaiñ kathām kriyate: varṇāḥ kārottaraḥ (i.16) iti 'satre varṇasya' kārottaravavividhanabhañgajrasaṅgit. ucyate: satyam<sup>2</sup> etacchāstrabulāñ 'na kriyate: kiñ tu gāstrāntarabalāt<sup>3</sup> kriyate: yathā: pāñiniyā 'era-kāra apikāra' ityādindīn sddhutvaiñ kathayanti: evam atrā 'pi evam aḥkāra ḍāgama (i.23) ity atra<sup>4</sup> codyaparihārāu vijñeyāu.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. varṇabdhasya. <sup>2</sup> G. M. tasya. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. evakāre 'pi. \* G. M. atra 'pi.

be added here to the syllable *an?* since offense is thus committed against the precept in rule 16, above, that *kāra* is added to an alphabetic sound to form its name. His answer is: true enough that it is not done by authority of this text-book; but it is done by the authority of other text-books; for example, Pānini's followers establish the propriety of such expressions as *evakāra*, *api-kāra* (for the words *eva* and *api*). So likewise in this very treatise (in rule 23, above) we have *ahkāra* for *ah*; and the same objection and answer are to be understood as applying there. See the note under rule 16.

## १८ एकवर्णः पदमपृत्तः ॥ ५४ ॥

54. A single sound composing a word is called *aprakta*.

The commentator explains *ekavarnah* after the fashion usual with him in treating a *karmudhāraya* or determinative compound: "that is both single (*eka*) and a sound (*varna*); hence, a single sound." The term *aprakta* means, he says, 'uncombined with a consonant.' As example of an *aprakta* word, he quotes *sa uv eka-viñçavartanih* (iv.3.3<sup>2</sup>), where *uv* is, by rule ix.16, representative of the particle *u*; and, as counter-example, to illustrate the force of the specification "composing a word," *yajñapatásu iti* (vi.6.2<sup>3</sup>), where *v*, though in a manner isolated, is not *aprakta*, being only a fragment of a word. Rule ix.16 exemplifies the use of the term.

## आध्यतत्त्वम् ॥ ५५ ॥

55. And is treated both as initial and as final.

As an instance of the treatment of an *aprakta* word as initial, the commentary again cites the passage *sa uv ekaviñçavartanih* (iv.3.3<sup>2</sup>), and declares that in it is to be seen the effect of rule 41, above (G. M. have here a *lacuna*, and omit the reference to the rule, along with the other instance). This is quite unintelligible to me, since

54. *ekaṣ cā 'súu varnac cā' 'kavarṇah: sa cet padam bhavati so 'prktah<sup>1</sup> syát. yathā: sa---- padam iti kim: yaj---- sam-jñāyāḥ prayojanam: ukāro 'prktah prakṛtyā<sup>2</sup>* (ix.16) *iti. aprakta iti vyanjanenā 'samnyuta' ity arthaḥ*

<sup>1</sup> B. ins. *sa*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*ktasamjñā*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. add the remaining two words of the cited rule. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*yukta*.

55. *cakārānvādīshṭām tad aprktasamjñam padam ādyantavac' ca kāryabhaṭg bhavati. ādivad yathā: sa---- ity atra 'tasyā "dir uccāistarām* (i.41) *iti kāryam bhavati: antavad yathā: o te---- ity atrā<sup>5</sup> 'ntah* (iv.3) *iti pragrahakāryam<sup>6</sup> bhavati. ādiç cā 'ntaç cā "dyantāu: tdu ivā "dyantavat.*

<sup>5</sup> G. M. *ādivad ant-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. -*ho*.

the rule referred to teaches nothing whatever that is characteristic of an initial sound,—indeed, teaches no *kāryam*, ‘effect,’ at all. For the treatment of such a word as a final, we have as an example the passage *o te yanti* (i.4.33), in which *o* is *pragraha*; with reference to rule iv.3, which teaches that only a final vowel is *pragraha*.

With this rule and the preceding compare Vāj. Pr. i.151–2, which are nearly identical with them in form and meaning. The Rik Pr. does not define the term *apṛktā*, but gives respecting it a rule corresponding with the present one. Both give in illustration the same passage, *indre* “*hi* (*indra*: *a*: *ihi*), analogous with the one (*bhakshe* “*hi*” iii.2.5<sup>1</sup>) quoted below, under v.3

## वर्णस्थि विकारलोपी ॥५६॥

56. Alteration and omission are of a single sound.

That is to say, not of a whole word. Where, as by v.19, more than one letter is omitted, each is specified. The cited examples are, of alteration, *dhūrshādhdū* (i.2.8<sup>2</sup>: by rule v.10); of omission, *sa te jānāti* (i.2.14<sup>2-3</sup>: by rule v.15).

I find this rule expressly appealed to but once in the sequel (under ix.7).

## विनाशो लोपः ॥५७॥

57. Omission is complete loss.

As example of *lopa*, ‘omission,’ the commentator quotes the passage *sa īm’ andrā suprayasah* (iv.1.8<sup>1-2</sup>), where the initial *m* of *mandrā* is lost after *īm* (by rule v.12: see the note there given). As example of the use of the term, he gives rule v.11, which is introductory to the subject of omissions. He then proceeds to state a very curious reason why such a precept as this should seem called for: “some have maintained the eternity of sound: in order to the confutation of that doctrine, this rule hath been uttered, in conformity with general grammar.” Pāṇini’s corresponding precept (i.1.60) is *adarganam lopah*, ‘omission is disappearance from view.’

56. *varnamātrasya vikāralopāu syātām na tu sarvasya padasya. vikāras tāvat: dhū-iti: 'lopas tu': sa-----*

<sup>(1)</sup> W. om. B. omits this whole comment, along with the following rule.

57. *varṇavindō<sup>1</sup> lopasamjnō bhavati. yathā: sa----- samjnāyād prayojanam: atha lopah* (v.11) *ity adi. varṇasyā ni-tyatām kecid dhūh: tannirdkaranya vyākaranānusdrena sūtram etad abhāni.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *varṇasya v-*

## अन्वादेशो अत्यस्य ॥५८॥

58. Continued implication is of that which was last.

The term *anvâdeça*, ‘after-indication,’ with its corresponding verbal forms, and other equivalent expressions (especially *anvâkarshaka*, *âkarshaka*, etc.), is constantly employed in the commentary to signify the continued force in a given rule of some specification made in a preceding rule. And the simple meaning of the present precept appears to be, that such a bringing forward is of the predicate last used, the word last cited, or the like. The commentator’s first example is entirely accordant with this understanding: in rule vii.3, namely, to the effect that the *n* of *hanyâd* and *upyamânam* is changed to *n*, the implication is “after *nîh*,” *nîh* being the last mentioned in a list of altering words given in the preceding rule. But he goes on to make another application of the precept: rule xv.8 says “*a*, however, even in *samhitâ* [is protracted and nasalized];” and it is to be understood that only a “last” or “final” *a* is intended—as in *suçlokâñs* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>), protracted from *sugloka*; while in *brahmâna tvañ râjan* (i.8.16<sup>1,2</sup>), *agnâs ity âha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>), *vicityâh somâs na vicityâs iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>), where the words protracted are *brahman*, *agne*, *somâh*, and *vicityâh*, and the *a* is not a final, there is no nasalization. Evidently, this is a wholly forced and false interpretation: no rule can mean two things so utterly different. Compare the notes to iv.3 and xv.8, where the principle is appealed to.

The comment seeks a kind of support for its double interpretation by calling attention to the distinction between an “affecting cause” (*nimitta*), like the *nîh* brought forward from vii.3 to vii.3 in the first example, and an “affected” word or element (*nimittin*, ‘having a cause’), such as is concerned in the second example. The latter (nearly synonymous with *lakshya*, used in the comment to i.22) he defines as “something original (? *pradhâna* seems to be taken here in the sense of *prakrti*) suffering a prescribed effect.”

No one of the other Pratiçâkyas attempts to lay down any rules as to the *anvâdeça* (or *anuvṛtti*); and its usages are, in fact, wholly irreducible to rule—a circumstance which involves the condemnation of the *sûtra* style of composition, because the *sûtras* are not and cannot be self-explanatory, or intelligible without an authoritative comment.

---

58. *nimittasya nimittino vâ 'ntyasyâ 'nvâdeço bhavati: nimitti 'ti pradhânâm<sup>1</sup> kâryabhâg iti yâvat. nimittasya yathâ: hanyâd upyamânam ca* (vii.3) *ity asyâ 'tra<sup>2</sup> nîçabdasya. nimittino yathâ: akâras tu sañhitâyâm api* (xv.8) *ity atra suçlokâñs<sup>3</sup> ity antyasyâ 'kârasya: antyasye 'ti kim: brah-----: ag-----: vic-----.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -nâm; G. M. -na. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> B. om. all the signs of protraction.

## उपबन्धस्तु देशाय नित्यम् ॥५६॥

59. An *upabandha*, however, is for that particular passage, and of constant effect.

The commentator etymologizes *upabandha*, ‘connection, tie,’ as representing the meaning *upabandhyate*, ‘it is tied up, bound to;’ and he farther defines it as signifying a passage pointed out by the indication “in that,” and one which is designated by an enumeration—referring to rules iv.22,23,48,52 as examples. An *upabandha*, then, is a connected part of the *Sanhita*, pointed out and defined by the rules of the *Pratiçākya* in various ways: by citing the first words of a single verse (iv.20) or of an *anuvāka* (iv.25,48; xi.3); by the accepted title of a number of *anuvākas*, either succeeding one another or otherwise (ii.9,11; iv.52; ix.20; xi.3); by giving the first and last words of a passage (iv.22,23); or by fixing a limit within a certain number of words from a specified word (iv.52). Respecting such a passage, we are told, this rule is intended to teach two things: first, that what is prescribed for it does not hold good in other passages—this is signified by the word *tu*, ‘however,’ in the rule;—second, that an exception which applies in other passages does not apply in it—this is signified by the word *nityam*, ‘constantly, in all cases.’

Both prescriptions, as thus stated, the commentator undertakes to illustrate by quoted cases of their application. But his first illustration is imperfectly and obscurely set forth, and is, besides, of a very questionable character. He tells us that the passage *ity aha devī hy eshā devah somah* (vi.1.7<sup>7</sup>) is brought, by the principle laid down in the next rule but one (i.61), under the action of rule iv.25—and this is all that he deigns to say about it. The meaning is this: the passage quoted contains a series of four words, *ity aha devī hi*, which are also found at ii.6.7<sup>5</sup> (*devī devaputre ity aha devī hy ete devaputre*); and, as the *i* of *derī* in the latter passage is *pragraha* by iv.25, so, under the operation of i.61, it should be *pragraha* also in the other. Such, however, is not the case; for *devī* in *devī hy eshā* is singular, while in *devī hy ete* it is dual. It would seem, then, as if we ought to understand the commenta-

59. *upabandhas tu svadeśyāśi'va nityam nirdeṣako bhavati: upabandhyata' ity upubandhah: etasminn ity<sup>2</sup> adhikaranurūpāḥ samkhyānavishayaç ca pradeça upabandha ity ucyate. yathā: iravatī (iv.22) ity adī sātradvayam: somāya svai'tasmin (iv.48): gamayato bhavataḥ (iv.52) iti ca. upabandhe yad uktam tād anyatra na bhavati 'ti tuçabdārthaḥ. yathā: ity....: atra tripadaprabhṛtīnyāyena (i.61) pūrvajeprabhrtyā'yam (iv.25) iti prāptih. anyatra yo nishedhah sa upabandhe na bhavatī 'ti nityaçabdārthaḥ. yathā: sudohavirdhāne (iv.11) iti prāgraho grahishyate: kevalahavirdhāna' iti sarvatha'*

tor to maintain that the present rule annuls the application of i.61, and, through it, of iv.25, to the case in question. But this is wholly inadmissible: for rule 61, below, is directly intended as a limitation to the present one, and has no force or value except as it applies to just such passages as the one here instanced; and with the latter are closely analogous a part of the examples adduced for its illustration, and leading to an opposite conclusion to the one here apparently arrived at. I cannot account for the way in which the commentator treats the matter. So far as I can see, *devī* at vi.1.7<sup>7</sup> is *pragraha* according to the rules of the Prātiçākhyā, and has only by some oversight escaped being specially excepted: and the first restriction is of a general character, meaning that directions given for an *upabandha* passage are intended for that passage alone, and have no wider bearing—except as they receive it from i.61. The same, as will be seen below, limits also the other restriction, that expressed by *nityam*.

Further, the citation in rule iv.11 of the compound *sadohavirdhāne* as *pragraha* implies that the simple word *havirdhāne* would always be of a contrary character, as it in fact is in the passage *havirdhāne khyāyante* (vi.2.11<sup>1</sup>); but this implication does not hold in the passage *havirdhāne prācī pravartayeyuh* (iii.1.3<sup>1</sup>), because of the inclusion of the latter among the *upabandhas* of rule iv.52. Here, however, is brought up an objection: the explanation given is not satisfactory, because an exception made elsewhere is sometimes of force also in an *upabandha* passage. For instance, in the passage *atha mithunī bhavataḥ* (vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>), the word *mithunī*, which would else be *pragraha* by iv.52, is made otherwise by iv.53. Again, an example of a similar class is afforded by *vāyave drohanavādhāu* (v.8.21), where *vāyave* ought to be *pragraha*, because occurring in the *anuvāka* to which iv.48 refers, while it is deprived of that character by iv.54. The answer is made, that, in the case of *grāmī*, *vāyave*, *manave*, and the like, the exception must be allowed to have force because those words are excepted by specific mention; while the exception of *havirdhāne* is inferential only, and therefore does not hold good: specific mention being of more force than mere inference.

---

*na pragraho gr̄hyate: yathā: hav---- ity ayam atra<sup>8</sup> nishedhāḥ: hav---- ity atra na prasurati: gamayato bhavataḥ* (iv.52) *ity adinā prāptih. nanv etad anupapannam: anyatra nishedhasya kvacid upabandhe 'pi darçandt: yathā: atha---- ity atra gamayato bhavataḥ* (iv.52) *ity upabandhaprāptir na grāmī* (iv.53) *ity adinā 'nyatra<sup>9</sup> nishedhena nishidhyate: tathā<sup>10</sup>: vāy---- ity atra somāya sva* (iv.48) *iti prāptir ate samānapada* (iv.54) *ity anenā 'nyatra nishedhena nishidhyate. atro 'cyate: grāmī vāyave manava ity adināñ kanṭhoktatvād esha nishedhāḥ prasaratu<sup>11</sup> kevalahavirdhāne<sup>12</sup> pragraho<sup>13</sup> ne 'ty arthiko nishedho na prasaraty eva: arthikakanṭhoktayoh kan-*

But this suggests a further objection: why then is not the specific mention of *ate* and *ave* in rule iv.54 enough, and what is the use of adding the word *nityam*, ‘in all cases,’ in that rule? This, replies the commentator, is for the purpose of making the exception yet more strongly binding: the specific mention merely annuls the application of the *upabandha* rule; the addition of *nityam* avoids the application of any other rule. For example, in *dve jdye vindate* (vi.6.4<sup>3</sup>), *vindate* should be *pragraha* (by rule iv.51), because separated by only one word from *dve*; and in *vanaspate vīdvanīgah* (iv.6.6<sup>5</sup>), the same character would belong to *vanaspate* (by iv.38) because followed by *vīd*—and we are left to infer that the *nityam* renders rule iv.54 capable of reaching these passages, and taking away the *pragraha* character of the two words in question. This, adds the commentator, may be still further pursued; it has been thus drawn out in accordance with the view of Māhisheya.

In all this exposition is to be seen something of the artificial and hair-splitting character which is apt to belong to a Hindu comment, while upon the whole it is sound and to the point. The term *upabandha* is doubtless better understood actively, as representing *teno pabandhyate*, ‘that whereby there is binding up:’ the presence of *decaya* in the rule is hardly reconcilable with the other interpretation. The intent of the specification *nityam* is to exclude general exceptions, made in view of other passages, or of the text at large, but not at all to deny the possibility of exceptions made expressly for the *upabandha* passages: and such are iv.53 and others, referred to by the objector, and refuted by an inapplicable special pleading. The force which the commentator ascribes to the *tu* of the rule belongs rather to *decaya*, and the *tu* has the value of a general disjunctive, bringing in a precept not connected with what has gone before.

Any additional instances of the application of the principles here laid down I have not searched for or chanced upon. The rule is appealed to but once in the sequel (under iv.54).

## नानापदीयं च निमित्तं प्रग्रहस्तादिषु ॥ ६० ॥

60. Also a cause belonging to another word, in the case of a *pragraha* or of a word containing *anusvāra*.

---

*thoktasya prābalyat. nanv ate ave* (iv.54) *ity anayoh kāñthoktyā 'vā 'lam: tatra nityagrahānena kim. ucyate: nitarām pari-hārah: kāñthoktir upabandhaprāptim eva nivartayati nitya-  
bdas tu prāptyantaram api parihaarati: yathā: dve... ity atra  
ekav yaveto 'pi* (iv.51) *iti prāptih: van... iti*<sup>14</sup> *vīd* (iv.38)  
*ādiprāptih: evam ddy uhanīyam*<sup>15</sup>. *māhisheyamatānusārenai  
'vam prapañcitam.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *upanibadhyata*. <sup>2</sup> W. *itya*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. *tu*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *kevalam  
hav-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sarvadhd.* <sup>7</sup> W. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *anyatra*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *ya-  
thā*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *-rati*. <sup>12</sup> B. *kevalam h-*. <sup>13</sup> W. *-he*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. ins. *atra*. <sup>15</sup> G. M.  
*-niyamam.*

The intent of this rule is made sufficiently clear by the commentator, but he is unable to show satisfactorily its connection, or the implication in virtue of which it comes to mean what it does. He puts, however, a bold face upon it, and declares that the *ca*, ‘also,’ implies the negative (*nañ*: compare Pânini ii.2.6 etc.) meaning signified by *tu* (that is to say, the *tu* of the preceding rule). This is quite unintelligible. More defensible would be the continuance of *nityam*, ‘constantly’: this, indeed, I conceive to be the real interpretation of the *ca*; although the rule is even thus left insufficiently explained by its context. The term *srâdishu* points us to the sixteenth chapter, where is to be found an enumeration of all the cases in the Sanhitâ exhibiting an *anusvâra* which is not a consequence of the phonetic rules of the treatise—of all the words which in their *pada* form contain an *anusvâra*—and this enumeration is led off (xvi.2) with the syllable *sra*. Many of this class of words are pointed out, as elsewhere in the Prâticâkhyâ, by mentioning the words which they precede or follow; which latter, then, become in the view of the treatise their *nimitta*, or ‘cause’ (taking the *post hoc* or *ante hoc* for a *propter hoc*). Inasmuch, now, as the *pragraha* quality and the occurrence of this *anusvâra* belong to the word itself, independently of its surroundings, it becomes necessary to teach that, when a word has been defined by means of its surroundings as thus characterized, it retains its character even when separated from them, as it is in the *pada*-text. Or, in the language of the rule, the defined occasion of a *pragraha* or of a constituent *anusvâra* is of force, even when it is, or is in, another *pada*.

The commentator, in illustration of the action of the rule, refers us first to iv.28, where *ghnî* and *cakre* are declared *pragraha* when immediately followed by *p*; these words are *pragraha* also in the *pada*-text of the same passages, when there is a pause between them and the *p*. Again, he quotes rule xvi.11, where *mâ* is declared to have no *anusvâra* after it when preceded by an *avagraha*; that is, when it begins the second member of a compound, as in *ardhamâse devâh* (ii.5.6<sup>8</sup>): here, too, the precept holds when

---

60. *cakâras tuçabdaniगदिताम्॑ ना॒रथम् अनु॒दीतुः प्रा॒ग्रहेषु स्रादि॒शु च नाना॒पदासंबन्धि॒॑ निमित्तम् असांहि॒त्याम् अपि स्वाकृ॒यम्॑ उपादिति॑ ति प्राग्रहानुस्वाराकृ॒यम्॑ ना॒निवारते। यथा॑ः वाक्ष्यति॑ः ग्नी॑ चक्रे॑ पा॒पारे (iv.28) प्रा॒ग्रहाऽ॒भवता॑ इति॑ः अत्रा॑ प्राग्रहत्वे॑ पा॒पारेणो॑ पा॒दिष्ठे॑ पा॒क्ले॑ तथा॑ वा॑। स्रादि॒शु च॑ यथा॑ः ना॑ वा॒ग्रहा॒पूर्वाह॑ (xvi.11) इति॑ अवाग्रहेना॑ नुस्वार॒द्गमे॑ निशिद्धे॑ पा॒दक्ले॑ पि॑ ता॒था॑ वा॑। यथा॑ः अर्ध-.....॑ शतवा॒नत्वादाँ॑ तु॑ नाना॒पदियम्॑॑ निमित्तम्॑ सांहि॒त्याम्॑ एवा॑ कार्याम्॑ करोति॑ त्या॑ अयम्॑ आरम्भाह॑ः॑ यथा॑ः॑ गु-.....॑ प्रा-.....॑*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*bdena ni-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*dha*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *svik-*. <sup>4</sup> W. -*sarak-*; B. -*hanusvaka-*.  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. *pakdrena*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. *'pi*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> W. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. ins. *ca*.  
<sup>10</sup> G. M. -*ya*. <sup>11</sup> W. om.

the *avagraha* pause intervenes between the two parts of the compound: as, *ardha-māse*. On the other hand, the cause (*nimitta*) of nasalization of a sibilant or nasal, if in a different *pada* from the letter it affects, is efficient only in *sanhita*: for example, *cucishad iti cuci-sat* (iv.2.1<sup>5</sup>), and *pravāhana iti pra-vāhanāḥ* (i.3.3): and this is the occasion of the rule.

I see no reason why this rule does not need to apply also to the cases of an original lingual nasal (*n*) enumerated in the thirteenth chapter.

## यथोक्तं पुनरुक्तं त्रिपदप्रभृति त्रिपदप्रभृति ॥ ६१ ॥

61. A repeated passage, of three or more words, is as already established.

That is to say, the reading of any connected passage is as established by the rules for the first place where it occurs: if repeated in a later part of the *Sanhita*, where other rules, there applicable, would change its reading, it is exempted from their influence.

Several examples are given in illustration by the commentator. In the third chapter (*pracna*) of the first book (*kānda*) of the *Sanhita* occurs the phrase *devasya tvā savituh prasave cvinoh* (i.3.1<sup>1</sup>): but the same phrase is found also twice before, at i.1.4<sup>2</sup>, 8), and the initial *a* of its last word is cut off by the general rule xi.1; hence, when it occurs again in a *vājapeya* passage (namely at i.7.10<sup>3</sup>), where, by xi.3, the elision of the *a* is forbidden, the effect of the latter rule is suspended, and the passage reads as before. Again, the words *supathā rāye asmān* are first found at i.1.14<sup>3</sup>, where, as the *anuvāka* is a *yājyā*, the *a* of *asmān* remains unclided by xi.3; and when they occur again at i.4.43<sup>1</sup>, that letter still maintains its place. Once more, the phrase *sa jāto garbho asi rodusyoh* is read at iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>, and again at v.1.5<sup>3-4</sup>; the former time in an *ukhya* passage, where the *a* of *asi* is retained by xi.3; and it is therefore retained in the other passage also.

The commentator applies to the rule the restriction that in the repeated passage the word respecting whose form there is question must hold the third place (that is to say, doubtless, that it must have not less than two other words before it). In support of this limitation, he cites a case: at iv.ii.8<sup>3</sup>, in an *ukhya* passage, occur

---

61. *trayānām pudānām samāhāras tripadum: kāryabhājaḥ padasya trītyatvān vijñeyam: idṛgam tripadam: tat' prabhṛty ādir yasya tut' tripadaprabhṛti yathoktam pārvoktaṁ vidhiā karoti svavīcешанān<sup>2</sup> yatra<sup>3</sup> tripadaprabhṛti punaruktam cet. tathā: <sup>4</sup> lupyate tv akāra ekārāukārapūrvah* (xi.1) *ity anena prathamakāndatṛīyapracne dev---- ity atrā 'kāre hupte tad eva vākyān vājapeye 'py alopam bādhitvā tathāi 'va bhavati: tripadaprabhṛtitvāt. ubhā vām* (i.1.14<sup>1</sup>) *ity atra sup---- ity etad ud u tyām jātavedasam* (i.4.43<sup>1</sup>) *ity atrā 'pi tathāi*

the words *pr̥thivim anu ye antarikshe ye divi tebh�ah* (W. B. omit the first two words of the citation), and the *a* of *antarikshe* is left unelided by xi.3; but at iv.5.11<sup>2</sup> (in the last *anuvāka* of the chapter called *rūdra*: see rule xi.3) we read *ye pr̥thivyām ye 'ntarikshe ye divi* (W. B., again, omit the first two words quoted, and also give *ye ant-*)—which, but for his restriction, would be a violation of the rule. I cannot but question, however, the right of the commentator thus to limit the rule, for I have noted at least three cases where, if it be admitted, the retention of an initial *a* in a repeated passage would be left without authority: they are *pāvako asmabhyam* (v.4.4<sup>5</sup> and iv.6.1<sup>3,5</sup>), *preddho agne* (v.4.7<sup>3</sup> and iv.6.5<sup>4</sup>), and *dadhikrāvno akárišam* (vii.4.19<sup>4</sup> and i.v.11<sup>4</sup>). Whether there are other cases like that to which the commentator appeals, I am unable to say: but I cannot help suspecting that he devised this modification of the rule to suit that particular passage, without sufficient regard to what might be required by other parts of the text.

But he is guilty of another piece of arbitrary interpretation which is still more unjustifiable, and which he makes yet lamer work of defending. The term *tripudaprabṛhti* means, according to him, a series of words beginning with three words of which the third is the one whose form is in question—that is to say, a series of at least four words, of which one follows the word of doubtful reading. The case to which he appeals to establish this is as follows: the words *divas pari prathamañ jajñe agnir asmat* (W. B. omit *asmat*) occur at i.3.14<sup>4</sup>, in a *yājyā* passage, where *agnih* keeps its initial vowel by xi.3; again, the words *ituh prathamañ jajñe agnih* are found at ii.2.4<sup>8</sup>: there seems to be a repetition, and a reading of *agnih* founded upon it; but it is not proper to claim that the retention of *a* here has this ground; it is due to the inclusion (in rule xi.16) of *jajñe* among the words which do not cause the elision: for such inclusion would otherwise be to no purpose (since there is in the Sanhitā no other passage to which the prescription should apply). Any other case seeming to require the interpretation here in question I have not noticed; and we have the right to presume that, if the commentator had knowledge of one which supported his view more unequivocally, he would not have failed to refer to it. So far as appears, then, the sole object of this forced

---

'va. <sup>5</sup> sam tē vāyur (iv.1.4<sup>1</sup>) ity atra sa---- ity etat krāram  
iva (v.1.5<sup>1</sup>) ity atrā 'pi tathāi 'va. brāhmaṇavākyeshu tu<sup>6</sup> tri-  
padumātrād vā kāryam bhavati: brāhmaṇavākyeshu pūrvastha-  
lasydi' 'vo 'kteh<sup>8</sup>: yathā: imām agrbhñan rāgañām<sup>9</sup>  
(iv.1.2<sup>1</sup>) ity atra mar---- ity etad vākyam<sup>10</sup> ut krāma (v.1.3<sup>1</sup>)  
ity atrā 'pi tathāi 'va bhavati. kāryabhājah padasya trīyatvam  
iti kim: pr̥th---- ity <sup>11</sup> ukhye: ye---- iti rudrottamānuvāke.  
prabṛhti 'ti kim: tvam agne rudrah (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>) iti yājyāyām  
divas---- iti vākyam agnaye 'nnavate (ii.2.4<sup>1</sup>) ity atra

interpretation of the word *tripadaprabṛhti* (one which the word may be said decidedly not to admit of) is to save rule xi.16 from the charge of repetition in a single point: we shall presume with much greater plausibility that, when the rule was made, the fact that this particular case was already covered by i.61 was overlooked.

But the commentator virtually admits the unsoundness of his own work by acknowledging that in the *brāhmaṇa*-passages (*brāhmaṇavākyā*) of the Sanhitā a simple phrase of three words is enough to justify the application of the rule, "because," he says, "of the quotation in the *brāhmaṇa*-passages of a previously-occurring phrase:" that is to say, because the prose part of the Sanhitā is to so great an extent occupied with citing and commenting on the phrases and words of other parts—a fact which has, doubtless, been the special occasion and suggestion of the present rule. Thus, the words *maryacri sprhayad varno agnih* are quoted at v.i.3<sup>3</sup> (with the customary addition, *ity dha*), from the previous passage iv.1.2<sup>5</sup>; and although the *nābhīm* which follows *agnih* at its first occurrence is not also quoted, and the quotation is not therefore a *tripadaprabṛhti* according to the commentator's construction of this term, the rule holds good, and the *a* of *agnih* has a right to stand.

The general value of this rule is that of a limitation to the last but one; it points out a class of cases in which a rule given for a particular passage is not limited to that passage, but also acts elsewhere; in which, moreover, such a rule does not govern *nit-yam*, 'against all opposition,' the reading of the passage to which it relates.

The commentator notices the fact that the repetition of the final word of the rule indicates the conclusion of the chapter. Such repetition is made at the end of each chapter, and by all the manuscripts; and, as it is thus farther ratified by the comment, I have not hesitated to admit it as an authentic part of the text of the Prātiçākhyā. G. M. repeat the whole rule in this case.

---

*itah.... iti punaruktam: tat<sup>12</sup> tathā 'vā 'bharat<sup>13</sup> iti cet: mā  
'vam: tripadamātrād<sup>14</sup> eva tathābhāvū<sup>15</sup> iti<sup>16</sup> raktum nū yuktaṁ:  
kim tu jajñe sañspṛhānaḥ (xi.16) iti jujñegrahanasāmarthyāt:  
<sup>17</sup>anyathā tasya<sup>18</sup> vāiyarthyāt<sup>17</sup>.*

*padavipsd<sup>19</sup> 'dhyāyaparisamāptim dyotayati.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivaraṇe  
prathamo 'dhyāyah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. -ndya; G. M. -shena. <sup>3</sup> G. M. idām. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. hi. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. tathā. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. pūrvasyā. <sup>8</sup> G. M. 'klah. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. ins. ebhya. <sup>12</sup> G. M. om. <sup>13</sup> G. M. syād. <sup>14</sup> G. M. tripād. <sup>15</sup> G. M. tathā bhavatu. <sup>16</sup> G. M. ins. atra. <sup>17</sup> W. om. <sup>18</sup> G. M. tasydi 'va. <sup>19</sup> G. M. padārvṛtyā.

## CHAPTER II.

CONTENTS: 1-11, general mode of production of articulate sounds, distinction of surd and sonant sounds, etc.; 12-29, special rules for the production of vowels and diphthongs; 30, nasals; 31-34, difference of vowels and consonants; 35-39, mode of production of mutes; 40-43, of semivowels; 44-45, of spirants; 46-48, of *h* and *h̄*; 49-52, of nasal sounds.

## अथ शब्दोत्पत्तिः ॥ १ ॥

### 1. Now for the origin of sound.

For the word *atha* in this rule the commentator allows us our choice between two interpretations: it either indicates immediate succession—thus, the list of articulate sounds having been given, there next arises the desire to know what is the cause of these sounds, or how they become apprehensible by the sense, and then follows the explanation here to be given—or it is introductory, signifying that from this point onward the subject of the origin of sound is the one had in hand. Compare the similar and yet more lengthy discussion under rule i.1. He then goes on to draw out the significance of the rule itself. *Cabda* he explains by *dhvani*: both, when used thus distinctively, mean audible sound in general, rather than articulate sound or voice (compare xxii.1,2; xxiii.3). He paraphrases: “of the articulate sounds, *a* etc., the cause of perception, or their origin, their birth, their apprehension by the sense—just as, even before water is seen, there is moisture in the ground, and that becomes visible in consequence of digging—this is the subject of description.” We seem to catch here a glimpse of that same doctrine of the eternity of sound to which reference was made above, under i.57: our organs do not properly produce it, but their action brings it to the cognizance of the senses, as the action of digging brings water to light.

---

1. *ukto varṇasamāmnāyah*: *teshāṁ varṇānām kidṛk' kāra-*  
*nām'* *kathām vā tadupalabdhīr ity akāñkshānantaram*<sup>3</sup> *nirōpyata*  
*ity anantaryārtha* 'thaçabdah. *atha vā*: *ita uttarām yad vaksh-*  
*yate tac chabdotpattir ity etad*<sup>4</sup> *adhikṛtam veditavyam ity adhikā-*  
*rārthah*. *cabdo nāma dhvaniḥ*: *varṇānām akāñdinām upādā-*  
*nakāranām*<sup>5</sup> *tadutpattir*<sup>6</sup> *janma upalabdhīr vā*: *yatho 'dakasya*  
*'darçanāt pūrvam eva bhāmāu jalam asty eva tat khananād*<sup>7</sup> *dṛṣy-*  
*ate tadvat*<sup>8</sup>: *se 'yam ucyata*<sup>9</sup> *iti sūtrārthah*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *kidṛgam*. <sup>2</sup> W. *karaṇam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *ins. tan.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>5</sup> B. -*karaṇam*.  
<sup>6</sup> G. M. *tasya ut-*. <sup>(7)</sup> W. B. *om.* <sup>8</sup> MSS. *khananā*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *ārabhyata*.

## वायुशरीरसमीकरणात्कण्ठोरसोः संधाने ॥ २ ॥

2. By the setting in motion of air by the body, at the junction of throat and breast.

The first part of this rule (literally, ‘from air-body-impulsion’) is obscurely expressed, and of ambiguous meaning. The commentator gives three explanations of it, the first of which is also itself obscure. Agni (‘fire, warmth’—‘heat of the body?’), he says, impels Vāyu (‘air, wind’); that is what “air-body” means (but how?). From such an impulsion—that is to say, expulsion, effort at utterance—at the junction of, or between, throat and breast, comes the origination of sound. And he quotes a verse from the Cikshā (verses 8–9 of the Yajus version, verses 6–7 of the Rik version: see Weber’s Ind. Stud., iv.350–1): “the mind impels the body-fire; that sets in motion air; and air, moving in the breast, generates a gentle tone.” Again (or rather, apparently, as a part of the same explanation: but its inconsistency with the rest is palpable), he makes a copulative compound of *vāyu-carīra*, namely ‘air-and-body’: “from the impulsion of those two.” Once more, he quotes as the opinion of other authorities that *vāyu-carīra* means ‘the air in the body,’ the compound being of such a sort that that which should be its first member is put last, after the analogy of *rājadanta*, ‘upper incisor’ (literally, ‘king-tooth’—that is, as the Hindu etymologists explain it, ‘tooth-king, chief among the teeth’), and the other words composing that *gāṇa* (to Pān. ii.2.31). And he adds the remark that, in this interpretation, the air is understood as the cause of the impulsion, not its product.

In the translation of the rule given above, the primary division of the compound is regarded as to be made after *vāyu*; *carīra-samīrana* meaning an ‘impulsion by the body,’ and *vāyu* being prefixed in a genitive relation, ‘of the air.’ This is harsh, but appears to me more acceptable and less violent than the other constructions proposed. Practically, the point is of small consequence.

2: *vāyum agnih samīrayatī' ti vāyūcarīram: tathābhātāt samīrātāt: prerānd abhighātād' ity arthaḥ: kanthorasoh samīdhāne madhyadece gabdotpattir bhavati 'ti': cikshā cdi 'vām asti 'ti': manah kāyagnim<sup>1</sup> dhanti<sup>2</sup> sc<sup>3</sup> prerayati mārutam<sup>4</sup>: mārutas tū 'rasi caran mandrain janayati "svaram iti". vāyū ca carīram ca vāyūcarīre: tayoḥ samīrānam: tasmāt<sup>5</sup>. anye tv āhuḥ: vāyoḥ carīre sataḥ samīrānam: <sup>10</sup>tasmāc chabdo-tattir iti: tatre<sup>11</sup> 'tthām samāsaḥ: rājadantāditvāc charīrasya<sup>12</sup> paraniptātāḥ: carīre vāyur<sup>13</sup> vāyūcarīram: tasya samīrānam<sup>10</sup>: tasmāt. asmin mate vāyoḥ samīrānakartṛtvam eva na tu karma-tvam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *abhipā-* <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -gni. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *kānti*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sam*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. ins. *vāyūcarīrasamīrātāt*. <sup>(10)</sup> B. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *atre*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *-raçabdasya*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. om.

Compare with what is taught by our treatise here and later (xxii.1,2; xxiii.1-3) Vāj. Pr. i.6-9; Rik Pr. xiii.1.

तस्य प्रातिश्रुत्कानि भवत्युरः कण्ठः शिरो मुखं  
नासिके इति ॥३॥

- 3. The parts which give it audible quality are breast, throat, head, mouth, and nostrils.

The commentator explains *prātiçrutkāni* as signifying ‘the places of production’ (*sthāñdāni*), having to do with the resonance (*pratīçrut=pratidhvani*, ‘resonance’), of the aforesaid sound (*cabda*).’ He offers no remark upon the organs enumerated, but leaves their various offices to be derived from the rules which follow. But, in anticipation of the next three rules, he observes that they teach the three-fold quality of sound, as sonant, surd, and *h*-sound, rule 4 giving the definition of the first kind.

The Cikshā (v.13: Weber's Ind. Stud. iv.351) makes an enumeration of eight *sthāñdas*, or places of production of articulate sounds, dividing the “mouth” of our list into root of the tongue, teeth, lips, and palate.

संवृते कण्ठे नादः क्रियते ॥४॥

4. When the throat is closed, tone is produced.

The commentator treats this rule as a definition of the technical term *nāda*, ‘tone,’ and cites rule 8, below, as an example of the use of the term.

The Rik Pr. (xiii.1) gives a corresponding definition of sonant utterance, but specifies the aperture (*kha*) of the throat as the part whose contraction or closure produces the tone. Compare also Vāj. Pr. i.11. It is greatly to the credit of the ancient Hindu phonetists that they had gained by acute observation so clear an idea of the manner in which the intonation of the breath is effected in the throat; but precisely how accurate a knowledge

---

3. *tasya prakṛtasya<sup>1</sup> gabdasyo<sup>2</sup> rāyprabhṛtīni sthāñdāni<sup>3</sup>. bha-*  
*vanti: pratīçrut<sup>4</sup> pratidhvaniḥ: tatsambandhīni prātiçrutkāni<sup>5</sup>.*  
*saṁvṛte kāñthe nādāḥ kriyate* (ii.4) etāddinā sūtratrayena  
*gabdatrāvidhyam<sup>6</sup> ucyate: nādāḥ* <sup>7</sup>*svāśo hākāraç ce 'ti: tāvan*  
*nādalakṣhanam dha<sup>8</sup> 8.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *prakṛti*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *prātiçrukāni*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*çrukā*. <sup>4</sup> W. om.  
<sup>(5)</sup> G. M. insert this (excepting the rule) at the beginning of the commentary to the next rule. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *gabdasya* tr. <sup>7</sup> MSS. *nāda*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *ucyate*.

4. *saṁvṛte kāñthe yah gabdāḥ kriyate sa nādasamjñō bhavati.*  
*samjñādyāḥ<sup>1</sup> prayojanam: nādō 'nupradānam* (ii.8) *iti<sup>2</sup>*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *nādasam-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ity adi.*

they had of the nature and action of the vocal chords, whose tension produces the closure, we, of course, cannot say.

### विवृते आसः ॥५॥

5. When it is opened, breath is produced.

The explanation given of this rule corresponds with that of the preceding, and the rule cited for the use of the term *gv̄dsā*, ‘breath,’ is ii.10.

### मध्ये हृकारः ॥६॥

6. When in an intermediate condition, the *h*-sound is produced.

*Madhye* is explained as meaning ‘in a method intermediate between closed and opened;’ the rest of the comment agrees with the two preceding, and the cited rule is ii.9.

Of the other Prātiçākhyas, only that of the Rig-Veda sets up a third kind of articulated material, besides tone and breath; and that (xiii.2) derives the material from a combination of the two others, rather than their mean. I have already (note to Ath. Pr. i.13) expressed my opinion that the attempt to establish this distinction is forced and futile, and I see at present no reason for changing it. That intonated and unintonated breath should be emitted from the same throat at once is physically impossible. In loud stridulous whispering, there is a tension of the vocal chords only short of that which gives rise to sonant vibration; and if any one chooses to claim that the aspirations used in loud speaking partake of such a character, sometimes or always, we need not be at the pains to contradict him.

### ता वर्णप्रकृतयः ॥७॥

7. Those are the materials of alphabetic sounds.

That is to say, the three kinds of material just described—tone, breath, and *h*-sound, some letters having one of these as the material out of which they are made, and others another. Just so, it is added, jars and dishes have clay for their material, and thread is the material of cloth.

The commentator then goes on to raise and answer a grammatical objection to the form of the rule. Since it is the office of a

---

5. *vivṛte kāñthe yaḥ ḡabdhāḥ kriyate sa gv̄dasaṁjñō bhavati.  
saṁjñāyāḥ prayojanam: aghosheshu gv̄dāḥ* (ii.10) *iti.*

6. *samvṛtavivṛtayor madhyaprakāre yaḥ ḡabdhāḥ kriyate sa hakārasaṁjñō bhavati. saṁjñāyāḥ prayojanam: hakāro hacaturtheshv* (ii.9) *iti.*

pronoun to call to mind things already mentioned, and the words *nādā*, *gvāsa*, and *hakdra*, which are referred to by the pronoun in this rule, are masculine, why is the pronoun feminine (*tādā*, instead of *te*)? The reply is: “by the *dictum* of the *Mahābhāshya*, ‘pronouns effecting the equivalence of the thing pointed at and of that which is pointed out respecting it assume at pleasure the gender of either of the two,’ is established the propriety of the form used in the rule; therefore there takes place a mutual accordance, or apposition.” The passage referred to is apparently that found, not in the *Mahābhāshya* itself, but in Kaiyyata’s *Mahābhāshya-pradīpa*, nearly at the beginning of the work (I owe this reference to the kindness of Prof. Goldstücker): in Ballantyne’s edition (p. 7) it reads, with several variations from the text given by our commentator, *uddicyamānapratinirdicyamānayor ekatvam apādayanti sarvanāmāni paryāyena tallīngam upādādata iti*. Reference is again made to this passage for a similar purpose under v.2.

The Rik Pr. (xiii.2) has this rule also, in nearly identical form.

## नादो नुप्रदानं स्वरघोषवत्सु ॥८॥

8. In vowels and sonant consonants, the emission is sound.

The term *anupradāna* is etymologized as representing *anupradīyate* ‘*nena varnah*, ‘therewith is given forth an articulate sound;’ and *anupradīyate* is farther explained by *upādhyate*, ‘is obtained,’ and *janyate*, ‘is generated.’ As synonym for the same term is given *mūlakāraṇa*, ‘radical cause.’

I have already (note to Ath. Pr. i.18) called attention to the praiseworthy unanimity with which the Hindu phonetists define

7. *varṇānām prakṛtayo varṇaprakṛtayah*: *tā varṇaprakṛtayā bhavanti ye nādaçvāsaḥakārā uktāḥ*: *nādaprakṛtayah kecid varṇāḥ*: *gvāsaprakṛtayo* <sup>‘nye</sup>: *hakdraprakṛtayo* <sup>‘nye</sup>: *yathā mṛtpra-kṛtayo ghataçardvādayah*: *yathā vā tantuprakṛtayah patāḥ*. *nanu sarvanāmānah prakṛtāparāmarçitvān*<sup>१</sup> *nādaçvāsaḥakāreshu pumliṅgeshu*<sup>२</sup> *satsu tā iti strīlinçaprayogah katham sādhuh*. *ucyate*: *nirdicyamānapratiniridicyamānayor*<sup>३</sup> *ekatūm apādayanti sarvanāmāni kāmacārena tallīngam*<sup>४</sup> *upādādata iti mahābhāshya-vacanāt prayogaśādhutvam adhyavasīyate*: *tasmād anyonyādvayāḥ sambhavati*<sup>५</sup>.

<sup>१</sup> G. M. om. <sup>२</sup> G. M. -r̥cakatv-. <sup>३</sup> G. M. ins. *parāmarçārhesu*. <sup>४</sup> W. -prakṛti-nird-. <sup>५</sup> W. -ṅgatūm; G. M. *tattall-*. <sup>६</sup> G. M. -yasambhavah. <sup>७</sup> G. M. om.

8. *svareshu ghoshavatsu ca varneshu nādo ‘nupradānam bhati*: *anupradīyate ‘nena varṇa<sup>१</sup> ity anupradānam mūlakāraṇam*: *anupradīyata upādīyate janyata ity arthāḥ*.

<sup>१</sup> W. om. <sup>२</sup> W. B. -ṇd.

the true ground of the distinction between surd and sonant letters. European phonetists, after long perplexing the subject with such false distinctions as are expressed by the terms "soft" and "hard," "weak" and "strong," and the like, seem now at last to be coming to a universal accordance in the correct view.

## हृकारो हृचतुर्थेषु ॥ ९ ॥

9 In *h* and in sonant aspirate mutes, it is *h*-sound.

For the quality of this *h*-sound, see rule 6, above. The Rik Pr. (xiii.2,5 : rules 6,17) connects in the same manner *h* and the "fourth" mutes. Our treatise evidently regards the peculiar *h*-sound belonging to the sonant aspirates not as something that follows the breach of contact, but as inhering in the letter, in the same manner as tone in the simple sonants. Whether the Rik Pr. hints at a difference of opinion on this point may be made a matter of question. But the failure on the part of the Prātiṅākhyas to recognize the essentially compound character of the aspirate mutes, the fact that these differ from the unaspirated mutes by interposing something between the mute and the following vowel, is one of their marked weaknesses.

The commentator enters into no labored exposition of the rule, but spends his strength, rather, in defending its situation. He first suggests the objection that it is not in proper place, as offending against the order observed in the definition of the three kinds of material (the *h*-sound is defined last, and we should therefore expect the letters containing it to be specified last); but claims in reply that it is, after all, in place, being intended to obviate an undue extension of the preceding rule, which would otherwise be liable to be made, since *h* and the "fourth" mutes are included (by i.13,14) among the sonant consonants, to which that rule applies.

## अधेष्ठ यासः ॥ १० ॥

10. In surd consonants, it is breath.

Which are the surd consonants, was taught us in rule i.12.

---

9. *hakdraṣ<sup>1</sup>* ca *caturthāṣ<sup>2</sup>* ca *hacaturthāḥ*: *teshu varṇeshu<sup>3</sup> ha-kāro* 'nupraddnam bhavati. *nanu samjñāvidhānakramabhaṅga-prasaṅgān<sup>4</sup>* nā 'tre 'dam sūtram avatarati. *ghoshavatsv iti sāmānyān* nādo *hacaturtheshu ca<sup>5</sup> prasajyata<sup>6</sup>* ity atiprasāṅgaparihārārthatvād avataraty eve 'ti vaddmāh<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> W. *haṣ*. <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. B. -*bhaṅgān*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *jyeta*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *vādāḥ*.

10. *aghosheshu varṇeshu* cūḍāśo 'nupraddnam bhavati<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> B. omits rule and comment.

## भूयान्प्रथमेभ्यो ज्ञेषु ॥ ११ ॥

11. And more of it in the other surd letters than in the simple surd mutes.

Here *gvâsa*, ‘breath,’ is continued by implication from the preceding rule “in virtue of vicinage” (*sâmnidhyât*), as the commentator says (there being no *ca*, ‘and,’ in the rule, to indicate it directly). The other surd letters are the surd aspirate mutes and the spirants (excepting *h*). There is no separation made of these two classes upon the important ground that in the spirants the greater expenditure of breath inheres in the whole character of the sound, as being fricative, while in the aspirate mutes it consists in a brief emission between the explosion of the contact and the following vowel.

The Rik Pr. (xiii.6: rule 19) says “some regard the breath in the aspirates as quicker”—an ambiguously indefinite expression.

## अवर्णं नात्युपसङ्घतमोष्टहनु नातिव्यस्तम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. In forming the *a*-vowels, the lips and jaws must not be too nearly approximated, nor too widely separated.

The plain intent of this rule appears to be to guard against an excess either of openness or of closeness in the utterance of *a* and *ā*, while at the same time these two sounds are considered as alike in quality. Such is not, however, the understanding of the commentator; he declares it impossible to follow both directions in forming one sound, and directs that a division be made: excessive approximation is to be avoided in the case of *a*, and excessive separation in those of the long *ā* and protracted *ās*. If his intention had been to recognize the same difference in quality between *a* and *ā* which is taught by the Ath. Pr. and Vâj. Pr. and by Pânini (see note to Ath. Pr. i.36), he would have been likely to apply the two directions of the rule in a contrary manner, warning against over-openness in *a* and over-closeness in *ā*.

11. *sâmnidhyâc chvâsa iti labhyate: prathamebhyo 'nyesh. aghoshešhu gvâso<sup>1</sup> bhâvyan adhiko bhavati.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

12. *avarña uccâdryamâna oshthahanañ atyupasamhrtam atisam-  
ghishtam na bhavati: ativyastam ativivrtam <sup>2</sup>ca na<sup>3</sup> bhavati.  
oshthâu ca hanâ c' oshthahanta: dvandvaç ca prânitûryasendri-  
gânâm (Pân. ii.4.2) ity ekavadbhâvah: tad etad<sup>4</sup> ekasmînn ubha-  
yathâ na çakyate kartum iti yogavibhâgah kâryah<sup>5</sup>: akâre nâ<sup>6</sup>  
'tyupasamhrtam âkâre ca<sup>7</sup> plute ca nâ<sup>8</sup> tivyastam iti.*

<sup>(1)</sup> W. na ca. <sup>(2)</sup> W. eva tad; G. M. om. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. B. om. <sup>(4)</sup> W. G. nâ. <sup>(5)</sup> W. B. om.

The term *osht̄hahānu*, though singular, is declared to signify the two lips and the two jaws, and a rule of Pāṇini (ii.4.2) is quoted in justification of such treatment of a copulative compound.

### ओकारे च ॥ १३ ॥

13. Also in uttering *o*.

The “also” (*ca*) of this rule, we are told, brings forward only the action of the jaws prescribed in the preceding rule: this appears from the fact that the one following gives a special direction with regard to the action of the lips. In forming an *o*, then, the jaws are not to be too widely separated.

### ओष्ठौ तूपसङ्खततरौ ॥ १४ ॥

14. But the lips are more nearly approximated.

“Vicinage” is here again made the sufficiently obvious ground of assuming that the direction applies to the utterance of *o*. The “but” (*tu*) of the rule, according to Vararuci, one of the three authorities from whom our comment is principally derived (see the introduction), annuls the direction formerly (in rule 12) given as to the position of the lips: but Māhisheya, another of the same authorities, has explained it as exempting from the widely separated condition the *o* of such words as *bandhōḥ* (ii.5.8<sup>7</sup>). This latter interpretation is quite absurd, or else I am very obtuse with regard to it.

As regards the precise tone of the *o*, such directions as these can teach us nothing satisfactory. The only valuable conclusion which we derive from them is that the authors of the Prātiśākhya looked upon the sound as a simple homogeneous tone—not phonetically diphthongal, although in classification excluded (by rule i.2) from the category of simple vowels. The same, we shall see, is the case with *e* also.

### ईषत्प्रकृष्टावेकारे ॥ १५ ॥

15. In uttering *e*, they are slightly protracted.

13. cakāro hanumātrakāryānvādeçakah: osht̄hukāryasya parasūtrena viçeshavidihānāt. okāra uccāryamāne hanū ativyaste na bhavataḥ.

14. sāmnidhyād okāra iti labhyate: okāre kārya osht̄hāv<sup>1</sup> upasāñhṛtatarāu syātām: tuçabda osht̄hayoh pūrvoktavidhīm nivārayatī<sup>2</sup> ti vararucir uvdeca. māhisheyas tu babhāshe: bandhōr ity ādikam okāram savyāñjanam<sup>3</sup> vyastato<sup>4</sup> nivārayatī<sup>5</sup> ti.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. vār-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. vyañj-. <sup>4</sup> W. myes-.

That “they” means the lips is, we are told, sufficiently indicated by the dual number of the adjective. *Prakṛṣṭa*, ‘protracted,’ is glossed by *samnikṛṣṭa*, ‘drawn down together, brought near.’

## उपसङ्घृततरे कृन् ॥ १६ ॥

16. The jaws are more nearly approached.

The force of the comparative is explained by the usual term *atigayena*, ‘with excess.’

In the utterance of *e*, the position of the tongue is also a matter of importance, and is explained in the next rule.

## जिव्हामध्यात्म्यां चोत्तराञ्जम्यान्त्स्पर्शयति ॥ १७ ॥

17. And one touches the borders of the upper back jaws with the edges of the middle of the tongue.

The “and” (*ca*) in this rule we are directed to regard as bringing forward the *ekāra* of rule 15, “on the frog-leap principle”—that is to say, by overleaping the intervening rule. The terms descriptive of the organs concerned I have translated in accordance with the directions of the commentator, although much tempted to render *jambhyān* by ‘jaw-teeth, grinders.’ I cannot doubt that *jambhyān* is the true reading here, although the MSS. give a curious and perplexing variety of forms to the word, and *uttarāñ* *jambhyāñ* is not once read: T. comes nearest to it, giving *uttarāñ jambhyāñ*; W. has *uttarāñ jambhyāñit* in the rule, and *uttarāñ jabhyāñ* and *jabhyāñ* in the comment; B., *uttarāñ jabhyāt* in the rule, *uttarāñ jabhyāñ* and *jambhyāñ* in the comment; G. and M., *uttarāñ jabhyāñit* in the rule; G., *uttarāñ jabhyāñit* and *jambhyāñit*; and M., *uttarāñ jabhyāñit* and *jabhyāñit*, in the comment. The verb *sparçayati* is equivalent to *spr̄get*, the causative ending *nic* being added without altering the meaning of the simple verb (compare Pāṇ. iii.1.25), as in *pālay* for *pā*, and other like cases.

15. *prakṛṣṭāv ity utra dvivacanena prakṛtāv oṣṭhāv grhyete: ekāre kārya oṣṭhāv iṣhatprakṛṣṭāv syātām. prakṛṣṭatā samnikṛṣṭatā.*

16. *sāmnidhyād ekāra iti labhyate: ekāre kārye hanū upasāṁhṛtatare bhavataḥ. atigayeno 'pasānhṛte upasānhṛtatare.*

17. *ekāre kārye jihvāmadhyāntābhyaṁ uttarāñ jambhyāñt sparçayati spr̄ced ity arthaḥ: pālayati<sup>१</sup> 'ty ādivat svārthe nīc: jambhyāñ iti hanūmālaprāntadeçāñ<sup>२</sup> ity arthaḥ: mandukaplutinyydyena<sup>३</sup> cakāra ekāram ākarshati. jihvāyā 'madhyāñ jihvāma-dhyam: tasyā 'ntāu<sup>४</sup>: tābhyaṁ jihvāmadhyāntābhyaṁ.*

<sup>१</sup> G. M. *pālāy-*. <sup>२</sup> G. M. -*cam*; W. -*ntaprade-*. <sup>३</sup> G. M. -*kagatiny-*. <sup>४</sup> W. *ma-dhya antāu*; B. *madhyasya anān*.

In order to complete the definition of the mode of production of *e*, rules 20 and 23, below, have yet to be applied; but they add nothing essential to the description of the present rule, which assures to the vowel, as clearly as any such description could do, the “continental” sound of *e*, or that which it has in *they*, short in *met*. There is no hint of a composite or diphthongal utterance, any more than in the case of *o*. A diphthongal utterance, however, as *ai*, *au* (in *aisle*, *house*), we must assume them to have had originally (compare note to Ath. Pr. i.40).

उपसङ्घृतरे च निहायमृकारकीरल्कारेषु बर्वे-  
पूपसङ्घृति ॥ १८ ॥

18. The jaws, also, are more closely approximated, and the tip of the tongue is brought into close proximity to the upper back gums, in *r*, *t̄*, and *l̄*.

The construction of this rule is very harsh; the subject *hanu*, ‘jaws,’ comes into its first member again with a flying leap from rule 16, drawn by the *ca*, ‘also,’ while the second member starts off independently, “one approximates,” with no connective to bind it to the other. These roughnesses are unremarked by the commentator, and I have smoothed them over in the translation. The word *upasamharati*, ‘approximates,’ is glossed in the comment by *nikshipet*, ‘let one throw down (or apply),’ and *barsvād* is explained as ‘the high places behind the row of teeth’—that is, the swelling of the inner gums.

The commentator starts a question as to the propriety of the conversion of *r̄* and *l̄* in this rule into *r* and *l* after *a* (*rkārarkā-ralkāra*, from *rkāra-rkāra-lkāra*), the cases not being covered by the prescription given below (at x.8: no case of the combination of *r̄* and *l̄* occurring in the *Sanhitā*, the *Prātiçākhya* makes no provision for it): he is compelled to acknowledge that this treatise does not teach the conversion, but claims that it is justified by the authority of other text-books; and that the same explanation applies to an earlier case (rule i.31) of a like combination.

This wholly insufficient direction is all that our treatise gives

18. *cacabdo hanvor<sup>1</sup>* *anvādeçakah*: *rkādra rkādra lkāre ca kārye hanu<sup>2</sup>* *upasamhṛitatare bhavataḥ*: *jihvāgrām ca barsveshvū* ‘*pasamharati nikshipet*’: *barsveshv iti dantapañkter uparishtād uccapradeçeshv* *ity arthaḥ*. *nanv aram rkārapare* (x.8) *iti lakshā-sambhavād<sup>3</sup>* *rkārarkāralkāreshv iti kathām sāndhiḥ sādhuh*. *satyām nādītallakshāndt*: *kim tu gāstrāntarubalāt<sup>4</sup>* : *evam rkāra-lkārāu hrasvāv* (i.31) *iti vijñeyam<sup>5</sup>*.

<sup>1</sup> W. *hanvár*; B. *h*; G. M. *hanor*. <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*nas-*; B. -*nāsānijñavādād*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *ins. sādhuh*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *jñeyam*.

us for the utterance of the difficult *r* and *l* vowels. By i.2, they are excluded from the category of simple homogeneous vowels. For the teachings of the other Prātiçākhyas respecting them, see note to Ath. Pr. i.37. However they may have been pronounced at the period of grammatical treatment of the Vedic texts, we have no good reason to doubt that, at the time when those texts were composed, they were phonetically the same with the semi vowels *r* and *l*, differing from them only as, for example, the *l* of *able* differs from that of *ably*, the *r* of (French) *aigre* from that of *aigri*. For a theoretical discussion of this double value of the articulated sounds which lie nearly upon the boundary line between vowels and consonants, see Journ. Am. Or. Soc. viii.362 seq.

### एकेषामनुस्वारस्वरभक्तीश्च ॥ १९ ॥

19. As also, according to some, in *anusvāra* and *svarabhakti*.

In this case, we are told, the “also” (*ca*) brings down the whole of the preceding rule, and the meaning is, that there is approximation of the jaws in uttering *anusvāra*, and approach of the tip of the tongue to the gums in uttering the *svarabhakti*, according to the opinion of some; while others hold that *anusvāra* is simply nasal, and the *svarabhakti* (see xxi.15) equivalent to *r*. This, the commentator adds, is Vararuci's explanation, and its truth is questionable. We, in our turn, may regard it as matter for question whether this attribution and expression of doubt apply to the whole interpretation of the rule, or only to its concluding part, the statement of the opinion of “others.” The latter is perhaps most probable.

So far as regards *anusvāra*, we can hardly ascribe any value or propriety to this rule; the definition of *svarabhakti* in connection with that of the ?-vowels is natural enough.

### अनादेशे प्राणस्ता जिह्वा ॥ २० ॥

20. In the absence of special direction, the tongue is thrust down forward.

When no such direction as “with the point of the tongue,” “with

19. *cakārah pārvoktavidhim anvādiçati: yathāsamkhyendā' nusvārasvarabhaktiyoh pārvoktavidhir bhavati: anusvāre hanvor upasainhārah: svarabhaktū jihvāgrasya barsveshū' pāsainhārah: etad ekeshām matam. anyeshām tu matam anusvārasyā' nund-sikamātratvam: svarabhakter ḥkāratulyatvam. iti vararucimatam<sup>2</sup>: tac cintyam<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*kyo*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*ciracitam*. <sup>3</sup> W. *cityam*; B. *cāṇityam*.

the middle of the tongue" is given, then its position is to be understood as here directed. To explain *pranyasta*, the commentator gives, besides an ordinary analysis, the expression "in a quiescent state;" as example, he cites *upa mā* (iii.2.4<sup>1</sup>: G. and M. spoil the citation by adding the following word, *dyāvāprthivī*), in the utterance of which words the tongue is not called perceptibly into action. But this interpretation evokes a difficulty: "since the position of quiescence is assured to all the articulating organs in the absence of any direction respecting them, of what use is this precept?" The reply is: *e* (as taught by rule 17, above) is to be produced with the edges of the middle of the tongue, and the *a* contained in that letter is of the same character; hence it might be inferred, from the identity of the *a*-quality, that *a* was to be so uttered in other situations, as in words like *atha* (i.1.13<sup>1</sup> et al., if the word is to be regarded here as a citation)—a misapprehension which the rule removes. To this reply the objection may be raised that our treatise acknowledges the presence of no such element as *a* in *e*, and that an *a* uttered with the middle of the tongue is a phonetic impossibility. The direction respecting the tongue may well enough be regarded as a not entirely negative one; or it may have been deemed desirable to fix so very mobile and unruly a member by a special law.

### अकारवदोषौ ॥ २१ ॥

21. The lips are as in the utterance of *a*.

We are directed to include in this rule, by vicinage, "in the absence of special direction." The proper position of the lips for uttering *a* was given in rule 12, above. As illustration is added, quite needlessly, the word *indrah* (*passim*); the southern manuscripts read instead *indriyāvah* (vi.5.8<sup>2</sup>).

20. *yatra jihvāgreṇa jihvāmadhyene 'ty adir<sup>3</sup> anādecaḥ<sup>2</sup> tatra vishaye jihvā pranyasta tūṣṇīmbhātā<sup>4</sup> bhavati: prakarshena nyastā pranyasta<sup>5</sup>. yathā: upa----. nanv anādece sarvakaraṇānām tūṣṇīmbhāvāsiddheḥ kimartho 'yam ārambhāḥ. ucyate: ekārasya jihvāmadhyāntanishpādyatvam<sup>6</sup> asti<sup>7</sup>: tadavayavasyā<sup>8</sup> kārasya tathātvam asti: akāratvasāmyād anyatrā 'py athe 'ty adāt tathātvam prasajyeta: tac ca 'nishtam: tan mā bhād iti parihindrah. nā "dego 'nādecaḥ<sup>8</sup>: tasmin: upadecaḥbhādva ity arthaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *adindā*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *anupadecaḥ*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. -*nibh-*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *dyamānatvam*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *asti* 'ti'. <sup>7</sup> G. M. ins. 'pi. <sup>8</sup> W. *anvādecaḥ*; B. *anādecaḥ*.

21. sāmnidhyād anādeca iti labhyate: oshīhayor yatrā 'nādecaḥ tatrā 'kāravād akāre yathā tathā<sup>1</sup> oshīdhū bhavataḥ: nā 'ty upasāṁhṛtatārā<sup>2</sup> ity arthaḥ. yathā: *indra*<sup>3</sup> iti.

<sup>1</sup> MSS. *tathā*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. '-*hṛtāv*'. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *indriyāvā*.

## तालौ जिह्वामध्यमिवर्णे ॥ २२ ॥

22. In the *i*-vowels, the middle of the tongue is to be approximated to the palate.

The comment supplies, without remark, the predicate “to be approximated,” and gives as example *ishe tvā* (i.1.1 et al.).

## एकारे च ॥ २३ ॥

23. Also in *e*.

Here the “also” (*ca*) brings down the whole of the preceding precept, both the specification of the active organ (*karana*) and that of the passive organ or place (*sthāna*). The exposition of the meaning of the rule is very simple and easy; but the commentator does not fail to notice that its necessity is open to objection upon two grounds, and enters into its defense at considerable length. The first objection is, why make two separate rules (22 and 23) for a single direction?—that is to say, if the *i*-vowels and *e* are all produced by the approximation of the middle of the tongue to the palate, why not include them in one rule together? The answer given is that the degree of approximation is not the same in the two cases, but is less in the *e* than in the *i*-vowels. If it be asked, why is this so? the reply is made, because the *e* is mixed with *a*, and production of this *a* with the middle of the tongue is on account of its constituting a part of *e*, and not by reason of its own natural character (compare the comment to rule 20, above)—which special qualification is sufficient ground for the less degree of approximation. The second difficulty is stated thus: both place and organ of *e* have been already defined in rules 15–17, above; but here is laid down for the same letter something different: and it is not possible that both directions should be followed

22. *ivarne kārye jihvāmadhyam tālāv upasāṁhartavyam.*  
*yathā: ishe---- jihvāyā madhyam<sup>1</sup> jihvāmadhyam<sup>2</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> B. om.

23. *cakārah pūrvavividhim anvādiṣati: ekāre kārye jihvāma-*  
*dhyam tālāv<sup>1</sup> upasāṁhartavyam<sup>2</sup>. nanu vidhāu samāne prthak-*  
*sūtrārambhāh kimarthāḥ<sup>3</sup>. ucyate: ivarne yathā jihvāmadhyo-*  
*pasānīhāro na khalv evam ekāre kim tu tato<sup>4</sup> nyāna ity arthaḥ:*  
*kutah: akāramicritatvād ekārasya: akārasya ca tadekadecatvād*  
*jihvāmadhyāntanishpādīyatvam<sup>5</sup> na tu svataḥ: ata eva sopādhi-*  
*katvān nyānatvopapattiḥ. iśhatprakṛṣṭāv (ii.15) ity atra<sup>6</sup>*  
*sūtratrāyenālī kārasya sthānakarane nirdishte: iha tu tato "nyat*  
*tasyādī" va nirdīcyate: tad ekasmīn ubhayathā kartum na çak-*  
*yate: virodhāt tasmād atra yogavibhāgāh kartavyaḥ: avyañ-*

in the production of one sound. To get rid of this difficulty, a division must be made; the former description must be understood as applying to *e* by itself, and the present one to *e* combined with a consonant. How is this determination made? Why, when we say in a general way "the letter *e*," it lies nearest, or is most natural, to understand that letter itself, without a consonant; hence, because of its prior suggestedness, the first definition belongs to it; and the other is left, to be applied to the same sound as combined with a consonant.

The utter artificiality of the answer to the second objection is too obvious to need pointing out; and even the first evokes more difficulties than it removes. There is no inconsistency whatever between rules 17 and 23, and we have reason to be surprised only at the repetition in the latter of what is implied already in the former. Rule 23 has the air of being an afterthought, slipped in, because of the really close relationship between *e* and *i*, with disregard of what had been taught before. The alleged difference of degree of approximation exists clearly enough, but would be very insufficiently intimated by a mere separation of one rule into two.

## ओष्ठोपसङ्खार उवर्णे ॥ २४ ॥

24. In the *u*-vowels, there is approximation of the lips.

After his paraphrase of the rule, the commentator enters here upon an exposition, the intent of which is not altogether clear to me. "Here, he says, approximation is as formerly, and not mere drawing down together" (that is, of the same kind as was taught in rule 14, above, and not the *prakṛṣṭatā*, 'protraction,' of rule 15, which is there glossed by *samnikṛṣhtatā*?). "However, 'the lips drawn down together may be long'—this will be said hereafter" (by this phrase some direction given later in the treatise is

*jane tal lakshanam savyanjanetv etad iti. kuto 'yam niyamah. ucyate: 'ekāra iti' sāmānyoktā satyām<sup>10</sup> prathamam avyanjanutsyādi<sup>11</sup> va grahanam mukhyam<sup>12</sup>: tathā sati prathamapratites<sup>12</sup> tasmin prathamam lakshanam yujyate: savyanjanetv pāriçeshyād etad iti vijñeyam.*

<sup>10</sup> W. G. M. -*dhyāntāv.* <sup>11</sup> G. M. -*vydu.* <sup>12</sup> G. M. -*tham.* <sup>13</sup> G. M. *ato.* <sup>14</sup> B. -*dhyāntābhyañ nish-*; G. M. -*dhyaniñ-*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>16</sup> W. *nyasyādi*; B. *nye t-*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>18</sup> G. M. *ekārasya.* <sup>19</sup> B. *pratham av-*; G. M. -*manī vy-*. <sup>20</sup> W. *su-karam.* <sup>21</sup> G. M. -*marī pra-*. <sup>22</sup> G. M. *ins. tu.*

24. *uvare kārya oshthopasamhāro bhavati: atro 'pasamhārah pūrvavan na samnikṛṣhtatāmātram: kim tu: samnikṛṣhtāv oshthāv dirghāv syātām iti vakshyate: evam oshthāv tā 'pasamhātatarāv* (ii.14) *ity atrā'pi vijñeyam. yathā: ul-*.... *oshtayor upasamhāra oshthopasamhārah*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. *om.*

wont to be cited; but there is no such direction as this, either in text or in commentary); “the same is to be understood in rule 14, above” (compare a similar reference to a preceding rule in the comment to ii.18). A phrase is then cited from the Sanhitā, containing *u* and *ū*, namely *ulukhalabudhno yupaḥ* (vii.2.1<sup>3</sup>).

## २५। एकातरस्तु सर्वत्र प्रकृतात् ॥ २५ ॥

25. But, in all cases, with an interval of one from the preceding.

The commentary on this very obscure rule reads as follows :

By vicinage, “labial approximation” is here implied: everywhere, in the case of labial vowels, after the preceding labial approximation, a separate labial approximation is to be made, provided it have an interval of one: by this is understood having the quantity of a *mora* interposed: that, namely, has an interval of one whereof one *mora* is the interval or interposition. This is the distinctive condition of the separate labial approximation. The word “but” (*tu*) denies the necessity of the interval of one in a case where *o* [W. says, where *du* or *v*] follows. Examples are: *utpūtaguśhṇmam* (i.6.1<sup>1</sup>); *sūnniyam iti su-unniyam* (vi.2.4<sup>1</sup>); *atho oshadhishu* (iii.5.5<sup>2</sup> and vi.3.9<sup>5</sup>); *bāhuvor balaṁ* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>); *tamu-vāu ghordā nyā* (v.7.3<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word); *caturhotā* (not found in the Sanhitā: occurs Tāitt. Brāh. ii.2.3<sup>2</sup>).

Objection: in *yo ṇcum* (iii.3.4<sup>3</sup>), the *anusvāra* has a *mora* [by i.34] and the *g* a half-*mora* [by i.37]; since, then, the quantity being a *mora* and a half, there is not an interval of one, how is the separate labial approximation assured?

Answer: it is assured by the principle “a hundred includes fifty.” Where there is a *mora* and a half, there is *a fortiori* a *mora*; in virtue of this the prescribed effect is produced, but its excess does not vitiate the rule, because the word “one” excludes what does not belong to itself (?) For the same reason, the occurrence

25. *sānnidhīdd oshthopasamihāra iti labhyate: sarvatr' oshthyasvareshu prakṛtād oshthopasamihārāt pṛthagoshthopasamihārah 'kartavyaḥ: sa ced ekāntarah: ekāntara iti mātrākālavyavāya<sup>2</sup> iti labhyate: ekamātrā 'ntarān vyavadhānam yasyā 'sāv ekāntarah: iti pṛthagoshthopasamihārasya viçeshanam. tu cābda okāraparatra<sup>4</sup> ekāntaratvaniyamām<sup>5</sup> nivartayati. udāharanāni: ut: sūn----: atho----: bāh----: tan----: cat----: nanu yo---- ity atrā 'nusvārasya mātrākālah 'cakārasyā 'rdhamātrākālah:<sup>7</sup> evam adhyardhamātratve saty ekāntaratvābhāvāt<sup>8</sup> kātham pṛthagoshthopasamihārasiddhiḥ. ucyate: cātepañcācānyāyena sidhyati: adhyardhamātratve 'py<sup>9</sup> ekamātratvān sutārām<sup>10</sup> asti; tena kāryam bhavaty adhikām tu na nishidhyate: svāyoga-vyavachedakatvād ekaçabdasya: ata eva bāh---- ity āder<sup>11</sup> na*

of the double labial in such passages as *bāhuvor bālam īruvor ojāh* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word) is not primary (or original), but its quality as *sphurita*, ‘quavered,’ is shown by the likeness of the example (?).

Second objection: then why is there not a separate labial approximation in the two *u*'s following the *k* and *r* of *kusurubindah* (vii. 2.2<sup>1</sup>), since there occurs more than a *mora* and a half of interval between them?

Answer: not so; here there is denial of separate labiality only for the two *u*'s that follow *k* and *s*, because of the absence of its necessary condition; but to that following the *r* this rule does not apply, because it is not a case of separateness from the preceding, but of separateness from the *u* that follows the intermediate *s*; this being so, there is no occurrence of the interval of one for a letter in this situation: thus there is no offense against the rule.

So far the comment; but either I have failed to apprehend its true meaning, or it has given a false interpretation to the rule, or the rule itself is destitute of intelligible significance. I must confess myself unable to see what peculiarity there should be in the utterance of two labial vowels following one another in two successive syllables with not less than a *mora*'s interval between them. No precept, so far as I know, in any of the other Prātiçākhyas, is analogous with this, or casts light upon it.

It appears to be intimated, in the course of the answer to the first objection, that the peculiar utterance of the *u* in such words as *bāhuvoḥ* for the usual *bāhvoh* and *īruvoḥ* for *īrvoh* is denominated *sphurita*. The term does not occur elsewhere; nor is any notice taken of the phenomenon, if not here. It is a well-known characteristic of Tāittirīya texts, but is found in fewer words than one would be apt to imagine. Besides the two just given, I have noted in the Sanhitā only the cases of *tanū* (*tanuvam*, e.g.i.1.8; *tanuvā*, e.g.i.1.10<sup>2</sup>) and the word *suvar*, which are often met with. Of similar resolutions of an *i*-vowel into *iy*, the cases are more nu-

---

*dviroshtyam*<sup>12</sup> *mukhyam*: *kim tu sphuritatvam*<sup>13</sup> *udāharanatvābhāsatayād*<sup>14</sup> *darcitam*. *tarhi kus-ity* *atra kakārarephdbhyām* *uttarayor ukārayoḥ katham pṛthagoshthopasāṁhāro na bhavati*: *adhyardhamātravayavāyasambhavāt*<sup>15</sup>. *māi 'vam*: *atra*<sup>16</sup> *kakārasakārottarayor*<sup>17</sup> *ukārayos tāvad*<sup>18</sup> *pṛthagoshthatāt*<sup>19</sup>: *etallakṣaṇāṁsambhavāt*: *rephād uttarasya tu*<sup>20</sup> *prakṛitāt pṛthaktvābhāvān* *nā 'yam vidhiḥ*: <sup>21</sup>*kim tu*<sup>21</sup> *madhyasthasakārottarād ukārāt pṛthaktvam*: *tathā saty ekāntarābhāvāḥ*<sup>22</sup>: *tadavastha*<sup>23</sup> *eve 'ti lakṣhanam idam avyabhicaritam*<sup>24</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> W. om. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *-labhedavy-*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *arthāḥ*. <sup>15</sup> W. *dukkaravakārap-*  
-<sup>16</sup> G. M. *ekāmātrāñantarātvā-*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. om. <sup>18</sup> B. om. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *ekārāv-*. <sup>20</sup> G. M.  
om. <sup>21</sup> W. *muttārdm.* <sup>22</sup> G. M. *-āddu*. <sup>23</sup> G. M. *-thyatvam*. <sup>24</sup> G. M. *svār-*  
<sup>24</sup> W. *-haratvā-*; B. *-tvabh-*; G. M. *-nan tu ābh-*. <sup>25</sup> G. M. *-vyavadhānas-*  
<sup>26</sup> G. M. om. <sup>27</sup> G. M. *-rābhāyām utt-*. <sup>28</sup> G. M. *-vani*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. *na pṛthagoshtha-*  
*sāṁhāratā*. <sup>30</sup> W. *u*; B. om. <sup>31</sup> W. B. om. <sup>32</sup> G. M. *-vāt*. <sup>33</sup> W. *-sthay*; B.  
*-sthā*. <sup>34</sup> G. M. *vyabh-*.

merous, but less frequent. I have collected the following (without exhausting the Sanhitā, especially of themes in *iya*): *ágriya* (iv.5.5<sup>2</sup>), *aghniya* (i.1.1), *ágyiya* (ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>), *asmadṛīyañc* (i.4.21), *idhrīya* (iv.5.7<sup>2</sup>), *dīshṇīya* (iii.1.3<sup>1</sup>); *pōtriya* (iii.2.3<sup>3</sup>), *budhṇīya* (i.3.3), *rēshmiya* (iv.5.7<sup>2</sup>), *vicvāpsnīyā* (i.5.3<sup>3</sup>), *vicvadṛīyañc* (i.7.13<sup>3</sup>), *vr'shniya* (iii.2.5<sup>3</sup>), *pi'ghriya* (iv.5.5<sup>2</sup>), *sadhṛīyañc* (i.2.14<sup>5</sup>); and, of oblique cases from themes in *i* or *ī*, *indrāgnīyōḥ* (i.3.12), *gāyatrīyād'* (iii.2.9<sup>1</sup>), *pōrshṇīyā* (iv.6.9<sup>2</sup>), *pr'gnīyai* (ii.2.11<sup>4</sup>), *rā'treyai* (iv.4.1<sup>1</sup>), *lakshṇīyā* (ii.1.5<sup>2</sup>), *vicpātṇīyāi* (iii.1.11<sup>4</sup>), *svāddhīyam* (i.3.14<sup>6</sup>). None of the consonantal combinations which are thus avoided by the resolution of the *u* are such as the euphony of the Tāittirīyakas does not tolerate: but of those which are avoided by the resolution of the *i*, only three are met with in the text—namely, *try* (e. g. i.8.22<sup>1</sup>: ii.4.3<sup>1</sup>), *tny* (iv.4.2<sup>2</sup>), and *cny* (v.5.6<sup>3</sup>). I have not entered deeply enough into the investigation to deduce the law, if law there be, by which the resolution is made.

### अकारार्धमैकारौकारयोरादिः ॥ २६ ॥

26. The beginning of *ai* and *au* is half an *a*.

Rules 28 and 29, below, tell of what constitutes the remainder of these diphthongs.

### संवृतकरणातरनेकेषाम् ॥ २७ ॥

27. Which, in the opinion of some, is uttered with the organs more closed.

We have here another indication that, as intimated above (under ii.12), our Prātiçākhyā does not recognize the close or neutral pronunciation of the short *a*; for, if it did so, there would obviously be no reason for referring to the opinion held by certain authorities respecting its assumption of that utterance in diphthongal combination. Some phonetists (without sufficient reason, as it appears to me) have in like manner defined the first element in our English diphthongs ("long *i*" in *aisle*, *isle*, and *ou* or *ow* in *house*, *down*) to be the neutral vowel (*u* in *but*), rather than the open *a* (of *far*). But, whatever may have been the case with the Sanskrit diphthongs, our own cannot be truly described as composed of two elements each: they are slides; and to allow the organs to remain in

26. *āikārasyāu* "kārasya cā" "dir akārārdham bhavati. akārasyā 'rdham akārārdham.

27. *sāmnidhyād* akārārdham iti labhyate: *ekeshām* mate *tad* akārārdham *sāmvr̥takarāṇataram* bhavati. *sāmvr̥tāni* *sāmnikṛṣṭāni* *karaṇāni* *yasya* *tat* *sāmvr̥takarāṇam*: *atiçayena* *sāmvr̥takarāṇam* *sāmvr̥takarāṇataram*.

B. reads *sāmvr̥ta* throughout.

either their first or last position long enough to make the initial or final element distinctly audible, would be an error of pronunciation.

The commentator glosses *sunvṛta*, ‘enveloped, shut up, closed,’ with *samnikṛṣṭa*, ‘drawn down together, approximated.’

## इकारो अधर्दः पूर्वस्य शेषः ॥ २८ ॥

28. Of the former, the rest is one and a half times *i*.

Of the former—that is, of *ai*; *āi* and *āu* having been mentioned together in a preceding rule (ii.26), says the commentator.

## उकारस्तृतरस्य ॥ २९ ॥

29. But, of the latter, *u*.

That is to say, the remainder of *āu* is one and a half times *u*. To account for the word “but” (*tu*) in the rule, the commentator notes that, as the beginning of both diphthongs is the same sound, *a*, it might seem to follow that their end would be the same sound, *i*: this the “but” denies. This explanation merely intensifies and makes too precise the actual meaning of the word.

For the teachings of the other Prātiśākhyaś as to the pronunciation of *ai* and *āu*, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.40. As there remarked, the euphonic treatment which they receive proves their first element to have had originally more than a half-mora of quantity. If they must be limited to two *moras*, a better description of them would have been  $1\frac{1}{2}a + \frac{1}{2}i$ , and  $1\frac{1}{2}a + \frac{1}{2}u$ . If, as we may presume to be the case, the authors of these treatises defined their own pronunciation pretty accurately, then the *ai* and *āu*, not less than the *e* and *o*, had by their time taken on a value notably different from that which belonged to them when the euphonic rules of the language were the faithful representation of living processes.

## अनुस्वारोत्तमा अनुनासिकाः ॥ ३० ॥

30. *Anusvāra* and the last mutes are nasal.

As example of *anusvāra*, the comment cites *yo ṣīcum* (iii.3.4<sup>3</sup>);

28. *pūrvasyāi* "kārasye 'ty arthāḥ: adhastād<sup>1</sup> āikārāukārayoh sahoccitatratā<sup>2</sup>: adhyardha ikāra āikārasya ḡesho bhavati. adhikam ardham yasyā 'sāv adhyardhah.

<sup>1</sup> W. *adhyardhas* tāvad. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *uccar-*

29. *uttarasyāu* "kārasye 'ty arthāḥ: adhyardha ukāra āukāra ḡesho<sup>1</sup> bhavati: yathā 'nayor ubhayor apy ādir akāra eva tad-vad ikāra eva ḡeshah<sup>2</sup> prasaktah: tan<sup>3</sup> nishedhati tuçabdah.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-rasya* *ce-*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. om. <sup>3</sup> W. B. *tam*.

of the “last” or nasal mutes, *pratyāñ hotāram* (vi.3.1<sup>5</sup>)—to which G. M. add *prāñcam upa* (v.2.7<sup>3</sup>), and *manindā* (vii.3.14).

The term *anundśika* is interpreted by the commentator as signifying *nśikām anuvartate*, ‘it goes after the nostril’—that is to say, doubtless, ‘it finds exit by the nasal passages:’ an accurate definition of this class of sounds. As employed in this Prātiçākhya, *anundśika* means simply, as adjective, ‘nasal,’ and its derivative noun, *anundśikya*, signifies ‘nasality, nasal utterance.’ Rule 52, below, describes how such mode of utterance is produced, and in chapter xvii. (rules 1–4) is made an attempt to define the degree of nasality in the various sounds of the class. “Nasal,” or *anundśika*, by the present rule, are the *anusvāra* and the five nasal mutes, *ñ, ñ̄, n, n̄, m*; the same term is applied later to the nasal semivowels into which *n* and *m* (v.26–28) are under certain circumstances convertible; and at v.31, x.11, xv.1,6, xxii.14, we also hear of nasal (*anundśika*) vowels. The other nose-sounds, the *yamas* and *nśikya* (ii.49,50, xxi.8,12–14), do not anywhere receive this title.

It is desirable to put together somewhere a comprehensive statement of the doctrines held by the Tāittirīya-Prātiçākhya respecting the nasal constituents of the alphabet it recognizes, and no more suitable place is likely to present itself than is offered here.

All nasal (*anundśika*) sounds are uttered (ii.52) by the mouth and nose together. An *uttama*, a “last” or nasal mute, is a sound in the production of which the intonated breath escapes through the nose, while the organs of the mouth form one of those same contacts which give rise to the corresponding non-nasal mutes of the series. In *anusvāra*, on the other hand (including under that designation the nasal semivowels, of which more further on), the mouth-organs are not wholly closed, but the intonated breath finds exit through them at the same time that it passes through the nasal cavities. In all cases, then, in which the character of the nasal of a syllable is determined by that of the following consonant, the nasal will be a mute if the latter is a mute, but an *anusvāra* if succeeded by a letter not forming a contact—by a semivowel or a spirant. Respecting the phonetic character and occurrence of the nasal mutes, there has been no difference of opinion, so far as we have any information, among the Hindu phonetists of the period represented by the Prātiçāhyas; none of them has allowed a final *anusvāra* before a pause, or an *anusvāra* before a mute, either in the same or a following word. As to the phnetic value, however, of the real *anusvāra*, the nasal uttered with open mouth-organs, there was by no means the same accordance among those ancient grammarians. Some held it to be a pervading nasalisation of the preceding vowel; others, a nasal addition to

---

30. *anusvāraç co 'ttamāç cā 'nundśikā bhavanti: nśikām anuvartanta ity anundśikāḥ. yathā: anusvārah: yo----: uttamā ca<sup>1</sup>: prā----: <sup>2</sup>prā----: man<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *yathā*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. B. om.

that vowel. The former view is adopted and consistently maintained by the Atharva-Prātiçākhyā, which acknowledges nasal consonants and nasalized vowels, but no *tertium quid*. The Prātiçākhyas of the Rik and White Yajus are equally consistent in their recognition of an *anusvāra* as nasal appendage to the vowel, and the latter of them gives (Vâj. Pr. iv.147-8) detailed directions as to the quantity belonging to each element. The Tâittirîya-Prâtiçākhyā adopts prevailingly the same view, but lets the other appear distinctly in some of its rules. Thus, at v.31, it is stated to be Âtreya's opinion that, when a nasal mute becomes *l*, the preceding vowel is nasalized; and, in conformity with this, xv.1 directly teaches that, after the various conversion of *m* and *n*, the vowel before them becomes nasal, the following rules adding (xv.2,3) that some authorities deny this, and direct *anusvâra* to be inserted instead: here the commentary has to reverse the obvious intent of the text, and declare the latter rules approved, and the first disapproved. Further, x.11 directs that when a vowel is combined with a nasalized vowel the result is nasal (the commentary, however, gives a different interpretation: see the rule). Once more, in xxii.14, among "heavy" syllables is reckoned one that is *anundâka*, 'nasal.'

I very much doubt whether this difference of views is founded upon an actual difference of pronunciation; it is probably due rather to a discordant apprehension and analysis of a single mode of utterance. The same point might divide into two parties our phonetists at the present day—just as they have long been divided upon the question whether a *b* differs from a *p* in being sonant, or in being soft, or weak, or of inferior aspiration, or something of that kind. Without entering into any detailed discussion of the subject, I will simply say that I incline to side with the Atharvan school, and to believe in nasal vowels rather than in *anusvâra*. No one of the Prâtiçâkhyas gives an intelligible definition of the phonetic character of *anusvâra*, considered as an independent alphabetic element; if it is to be so considered, we shall hardly be able to make of it anything but a bit of the neutral vowel (*u* of *but*) nasalized, or the sound of the French *un*, and shall have to regard it as attached to the vowel much in the same way as, by us who speak English, the same sound not nasalized is attached to most of our long vowels before an *r*—for example, in *there*, *here*, *oar*, *cure*, *fire*, *sour* (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.353).

Which of the two views is originally favored by the Devanâgarî alphabet does not admit of much question; the writing of *um̄ca*, for example,\* with a nasal sign over the vowel of the first syllable, is an unequivocal recognition of the quality as something affecting the vowel itself. If it had seemed to the framers of this alphabet to be a something interposed between the vowel and the following consonant, they would doubtless have

\* Namely, अंश, or अँश

found for it a sign to stand between those of the other elements. This has actually been done, out of a true regard for consistency, by the writers of the Vājasaneyi and Tāittirīya texts: for lack of a better device, they have brought down one of the usual signs of nasality from above the syllable to a position between the syllables, giving it an addition which enables it to maintain its place there\*—in the Tāittirīya texts, we have the dotted crescent, with the *virāma*, the usual mark for a consonant not graphically combined with a following consonant, beneath it. The scribes of the Rig-Veda seem to have been less solicitous to make their practice square with their theory. It may well be made a question, however, whether the habit, now so common, of writing *aṁka*, *aṁta*, *aṁbā*, for *aśka*, *anta*, *ambā*, etc.,† could have grown up until the opinion had become prevalent that the nasal sign in *aṁga* also represented a nasal sound which followed the vowel, and was accommodated in its special mode of utterance to its successor.‡

One more point in the theory of the nasal sounds calls for notice. The assimilation of *n* to a following *l*, and of *m* to a following *l*, *y*, or *v* (v. 26-8), is treated by the Tāittirīya, the Vājasaneyi, and the Rik Prātiçākhyas as resulting in the production, not of *anusvāra*, but of a nasal counterpart to the semivowel—that is, the case is made analogous with that of a nasal before a mute, instead of before a spirant. Here, also, the Atharva-Prātiçākhya pursues an independent course, and accepts no nasal *y* or *v*, but only a nasal *l*, as product of both *m* and *n* (see Ath. Pr. ii.35). In this case, as well as in the other, we have to assume merely a difference in the theoretical explanation of an identical mode of pronunciation; and I should not only favor the Atharvan view, but should be willing to give up the nasal *l* itself, as not worth distinguishing from an ordinary case of *anusvāra*—or of nasalized vowel, if we accept this understanding of the matter. Thus much, indeed, may be allowed—that, while the absence of sonant utterance in the spirants cuts them off from sharing in a nasal quality, it might be difficult to prevent the nasality of the preceding vowel from infecting at least

\* Thus, for **अंश** or **अँश**, the Vāj. S. writes **अञ्श**, the Tāitt. S. **अংশ**.

† That is, **अंक**, **अंत**, **अंबा**, for **अङ्क**, **अत**, **অম্বা**.

‡ No valid objection can be raised against the, practically so convenient, imitation of this habit on the part of modern European scholars, so far as concerns the representation of an original *m* assimilated to a following consonant. To go farther than this, however, and write the *anusvāra* sign in the interior of a word for a nasal mute which is equally radical or thematic with the succeeding non nasal, and, yet more, to write it for a final *m*, which no Prātiçākhya allows to be pronounced otherwise than *m*, seems an indefensible practice, and one wholly to be disapproved and rejected. Of Müller's seemingly elaborate defense of his adherence to it, given in the Preface to his *Hipotadeca*, absolutely the whole point lies in the phrases (p. xi.): “it is easier to write *aṁkitā* than *aṅkitā*. What applies to writing applies with still greater force to printing”—which latter consideration must be pronounced destitute of weight; since, on the contrary, we do expect our printing to be superior in accuracy to ordinary writing.

the beginning of the sonant semivowels. For the exclusion of *r* from the same treatment with the other semivowels I can discover no good reason.

The usage of the manuscripts is pretty nearly in accordance with the theories of the Prātiçākhyā. For an assimilated *m*, the distinctive *anusvāra* sign is always written before *r*, as before the spirants; but before *l*, *y*, and *v* is written the sign of nasality above the preceding syllable, as before a mute. But as regards *n* before *l*, my manuscript varies with complete irregularity between treating it like *m*, as required by the Prātiçākhyā, and writing the *n* unchanged, either with *virdma* or conjoined with the *l* (instances of the latter mode of treatment are about twice as frequent as of the former). The edited text more usually follows a third method, supported neither by my manuscript nor by the Prātiçākhyā: it writes the *l* double, and puts a sign of nasality over the preceding syllable. This is nonsense: if two *l*'s are written, the first should be separated from the other, and should have the sign of nasality written above it. But there is no reason why this should be done in the case of a combination of *l* with *n* any more than with *m*, or than in the combination of *m* with *y* and *v*.

It only remains to add that, in my manuscripts (T. and W.) and those at Berlin and Oxford (B. and O.), the text of the Prātiçākhyā follows, in regard to the treatment of the nasals as to other points of euphony, the usages of the Tāittirīya text, and that the citations from the latter in the commentary are also written accordingly; while the body of the commentary itself follows the methods of ordinary Sanskrit texts. In this edition, therefore, their example is followed as closely as possible: the proper *anusvāra* being represented by *ñ*, and the *m*-assimilated to a mute or semivowel, by *m̄*. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G. and M.) do not distinguish these two from one another.

## स्वराणा यत्रोपसङ्घारस्तथानम् ॥३१॥

31. In the case of the vowels, that is their place of production, to which approximation is made.

The term *upasānihāra*, ‘approximation,’ is glossed by *upacleshaviveshah*, ‘a sort of embrace’—unless, indeed, we are to read, with G. and M., *samgleshaviveshah*, ‘disunion of embrace,’ i. e., ‘embrace which does not come to actual contact.’

The terms *sthāna*, ‘place,’ and *karana*, ‘organ,’ denote, as in the other Prātiçākhyas (see note to Ath. Pr. i.18), the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth whose concurrence gives birth to a sound.

31. *svarāṇām tat sthānam bhavati<sup>1</sup>* yatro *'pasamhārah syat:*  
*upasānihāro nāmo 'paçleshaviveshah<sup>2</sup>*.

<sup>1</sup> B. om. <sup>2</sup> W. *'paçlosh-*; G. M. *saṅgleshaviveshah*.

## यदुपसङ्घरति तत्करणम् ॥ ३२ ॥

32. That is producing organ, which makes the approximation.

Here, “in the case of the vowels” is declared to be implied from the preceding rule; *upasāñharati*, ‘approaches,’ is explained by *prāpayati*, ‘attains;’ and, as example of a *karana*, or producing organ, reference is made to the “tip of the tongue,” spoken of in rule 18 of this chapter.

## अन्येषां तु यत्र स्पर्शनं तत्स्थानम् ॥ ३३ ॥

33. But in the case of the other letters, that is place of production, where contact is made.

By this expression, the commentator says, simple embrace or union is predicated of the consonants, while above a sort of embrace (or disunion of embrace) was predicated of the vowels. The difference, he adds, between approximation and contact will be inferred by any knowing person from the force of the terms themselves. The word “but” (*tu*) is meant to exclude the vowels; or, as Māhisheya explains it, annuls for *anusvāra* and *svarabhakti* the quality of being produced by contact merely, like the other consonants. This last is a precious bit of pregnant construction; and the whole comment is more obscure than the rule itself, whose meaning and implication are sufficiently obvious.

## येन स्पर्शयति तत्करणम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34. That is producing organ, whereby one makes the contact.

The commentator supplies, as subject of the verb, the noun *adhyetd*, ‘reader’—or, rather, ‘repeater.’

32. *svarāñdm iti sāmnidhyāl labhyate: svarāñdm tat karaṇam bhavati: yat svarān upasāñharati prāpayati: 'tat karaṇam'. yathā: jiḥ vāgram ṛkāra (ii.18) ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *tat sthānam*; G. M. om.

33. *svarebhyo 'nyeshām varṇāñdm tat sthānam yatra sparṣanam bhavet: atra vyañjanāñdm sāṁcleshāmātrām<sup>1</sup> kathyate: svarāñdm tu<sup>2</sup> purastāt sāṁcleshāh<sup>3</sup> kathitāh: upasāñhārasparṣanayoh<sup>4</sup> ṣabdaçaktyā viçesho<sup>5</sup> vidushā vijñeyah<sup>6</sup>: tuçabdāh<sup>7</sup> svara-nivṛtyarthah: athavā<sup>8</sup>: anusvārasvarabhaktyor vyañjanavat<sup>9</sup> sparṣanamātrakatvanivartaka<sup>10</sup> iti māhisheyahbhāshitam*

<sup>1</sup> W. -gloss-; G. M. -mātratvam. <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. -shaviçeshah; M. -shaviçleshah. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -hāra tū sparcana. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. eva. <sup>6</sup> G. M. jñātavyah. <sup>7</sup> G. M. ṣabda. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> W. -nāve; B. -na. <sup>10</sup> B. sparcakanāmā-; G. M. sparcamātrakālān niv-; M. -vartata.

In these four rules is implied that distinction of opener and closer position between vowel and consonant which constitutes their essential difference (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii. 367 seq.), and which the Ath. Pr. states more fully (i. 29-35:—where, in rule 33, we should read *eke 'spr̥ṣṭam*), with specifications of degree of openness and closure which are here omitted (save so far as represented by rule 45, below).

### हनूमूले जिद्वामूलेन कवर्गं स्पर्शयति ॥ ३५ ॥

35. In the *k*-series, one makes contact with the root of the tongue at the root of the jaws.

Compare Ath. Pr. i. 20, and the references to the other Prātiçākhyas there given.

The locative and instrumental cases, in this and the following rules, correspond with the *yatra*, ‘where,’ and *yena*, ‘whereby,’ of rules 33 and 34, above, and point out respectively the place and organ of production of the different classes of sounds.

The singular number of *hanūmala*, ‘root of the jaws,’ the commentator accounts for as used generically (*jātyapekshāydm*, ‘with reference to the whole kind or class’).

### तालौ जिद्वामध्येन चवर्गं ॥ ३६ ॥

36. In the *c*-series, with the middle of the tongue, upon the palate.

Compare Ath. Pr. i. 21, and the note upon it. The sonant aspirate of this series, *jh*, is not met with in the text.

### जिद्वामेण प्रतिवेष्ट मूर्धनि टवर्गं ॥ ३७ ॥

37. In the *t*-series, with the tip of the tongue, rolled back, in the head.

Compare Ath. Pr. i. 22; and the note upon it. Our commentary says, “by the word ‘head’ (*mārdhan*) is intended the upper part

---

34. *sāñnidhyād anyeshām iti labhyate: svarebhyo 'nyeshām varṇānām tat karaṇam bhavati: adhyetā yena ṛyañjanāni sparçayati prāpayati tat karaṇam.*

35. *kavarga uccāryamāne jihvāmālena<sup>1</sup> hanūmāle sparçayati prāpayed ity arthah. hanor mālam hanūmālam<sup>2</sup>: tasmin<sup>3</sup>: \*jātyapekshāydm<sup>4</sup> ekavacanam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *varṇām*. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *mūlam* *iti. W. ksham.*

36. *gavarge kārye<sup>1</sup> jihvāmadhyena varṇān<sup>2</sup> tālāu spr̥get<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put *tālāu* here. <sup>2</sup> M. -nam. <sup>3</sup> B. *spr̥get*; G. M. *sparçayet*.

of the mouth-cavity." Perhaps we shall best remove the difficulties attaching to the use of the word "head" in describing this class of sounds, by assuming that the name *mūrdhanya*, 'capital,' had become firmly established in use as designating them, at an earlier period of phonetic science in India, when their mode of production was less accurately understood and defined; and was therefore retained by the later grammarians, who gave to it a new definition. For, that *mūrdhan* should have been taken directly and without ceremony to signify the 'dome of the palate' does not appear to me possible. As in the notes to the Atharva-Prātiçākhyā, I shall take the liberty of speaking of the *t*-sounds as "lingual"—a term, on the whole, as unobjectionable and as commonly accepted as any other.

The commentator glosses the word *prativedeshṭya*, 'having rolled it back,' by "having done what? having rolled back (G. M. add in explanation *dveshtya*, 'having rolled up') the tip of the tongue, on account of its suitableness" (i. e. of the adaptedness of this position to produce the contact aimed at).

**शिद्धाग्रेण तवर्गे दत्तमूलेषु ॥ ३८ ॥**

38. In the *t*-series, with the tip of the tongue, at the roots of the teeth.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.24, and the note upon it.

**ओष्ठाभ्यां पवर्गे ॥ ३९ ॥**

39. In the *p*-series, with the two lips.

The commentator explains that here the upper lip is the place of production, as the various places of production mentioned have been the upper organ; and that the under lip is the organ of production.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.25, and the note upon it.

37. *tavarge kārye jihvāgreṇa*<sup>1</sup> *mūrdhni*<sup>2</sup> *varṇam* *spr̥cet*<sup>3</sup>: *kim* *kṛtvā*: *yogyatvāj*<sup>4</sup> *jihvāgram* *prativedeshṭya*<sup>5</sup>: *mūrdhaçabdena* *vak-* *travivaroparibhāgo* *vivakshyate*<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put *varṇam* here. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. *mūrdhani*. <sup>3</sup> B. *spr̥cayet*. <sup>4</sup> W. -*tvā*; B. -*tvāt* *taj*; G. -*tvāñ*; M. -*tvāyoygyatvāñ*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -*shṭyāveshtya*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -*kshitah*.

38. *tavarge kārye jihvāgreṇa varṇam dantamūleshu sparṣayet*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *spr̥cet*.

39. *pavarge kārya oshthābhyaṁ anyonyam sparṣayet: atro*<sup>1</sup> *'ttaroshtha sthānam uttaratasāmyād*<sup>2</sup> *eshām sthānām: adharoshtah karaṇam*.

<sup>1</sup> W. *tatro*. <sup>2</sup> B. -*rātvāt sāmānyād*; G. M. *oshthatva-*

**तालौ जिह्वामध्यातान्यां यकारे ॥४०॥**

40. In *y*, with the two edges of the middle of the tongue, upon the palate.

The *Tāittirīya-Prātiçākhya* stands alone in omitting to rank the semi-vowels along with the mutes, as palatal, etc., and in describing their formation throughout by special rule. Respecting *y*, see the note to *Ath. Pr.* i.21.

The description of the mode of production of *y*, here given, is quite accurate and sufficiently distinctive. The “edges” are mentioned, as being the parts which form contact with the palate, the central part remaining open, as taught for *i* in rule 22, above.

**रेफे जिह्वायमध्येन प्रत्यग्दत्तमूलेभ्यः ॥४१॥**

41. In *r*, with the middle of the tip of the tongue, back of the roots of the teeth.

*Pratyak* is explained by the phrase, “in the interior upper portion”—that is, ‘within and above’—the equivalence of *pratyag-dtman* and *antar-dtman*, ‘inner soul,’ being pleaded as justification.

The somewhat discordant teachings of the *Prātiçākhyas* with reference to this sound are detailed in the note to *Ath. Pr.* i.28. The most note-worthy circumstance in their common treatment of the letter is that they so ignore its special relationship with the lingual mutes, and in part with the *r*-vowels: although in this treatise the definition of the latter (ii.18) is, essentially, nearly accordant with that here given for the semi-vowel! *R* could not possibly have the value which belongs to it in the Sanskrit euphonic system, if it were not a lingual semi-vowel, like the English *r*, uttered with the tip of the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate.

**दत्तमूलेषु च लकारे ॥४२॥**

42. Also in *l*, at the roots of the teeth.

According to the commentator, the “and” (*ca*) of this rule brings down by implication from the preceding both *jihvāgramadhyā*, ‘middle of the tongue-tip,’ and *pratyak*, ‘back from.’ It

---

40. *yakāre kārye jihvāmadhyāntābhyaṁ tālā sparcayet. jihvāyā madhyam: tasyā 'ntā: tābhyaṁ jihvāmadhyāntābhyaṁ*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

41. *rephe kārye jihvāgramadhyena dantamālebhyaḥ pratyak sparçayet: pratyag ity<sup>1</sup> abhyantara uparibhdga<sup>1</sup> ity arthāḥ: <sup>2</sup>yah pratyagātme <sup>3</sup>ty<sup>2</sup> antarātmā pratiyate.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*ntaropari*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *yathā pratyagātmani*.

appears obvious, however, if only from the locative case of *dantamūleshu*, that the latter item is not intended, and that we are to regard the roots of the teeth themselves (more properly, the gums close upon them) as the *sthāna*, or ‘place of production,’ of *l*. This, indeed, is nearly enough intimated by the final paraphrase of the comment. The really distinctive characteristic of the *l*, that it forms a contact in front, but allows the breath to escape at the sides of the tongue, is here by no means clearly brought out: rather, we are left to infer that it and the *r* are produced in the same manner, only the *r* a little further back. No one of the other treatises gives a better description (see note to Ath. Pr. i.24, where I have given the Tāittirīya definition more credit than really belongs to it).

### ओष्ठाताभ्यां दत्तैर्वकारे ॥ ४३ ॥

43. In *v*, with the edges of the lips, along with the teeth.

This rule cannot be commended for distinctness. The commentator gives it not a little of additional precision, by his paraphrase “with the two edges of the lower lip, along with the points of the upper teeth.” But how comes the lower lip to have two edges? He adds, that the teeth are the place, and the lips the organ, of production. But then why does not the rule read *danteshu*, instead of the instrumental *dantāih?* It gives us two instrumentals, as if teeth and lips were joint organs, and neither of them any more “place” than the other. The lower lip, being the more passive organ, should be the “place” on which the teeth, as “organ,” make their contact; but from taking this view the treatise and its comment appear to be hindered by the analogy of the other *sthāna*’s, which have uniformly been the upper of the two parts concerned in the contact. To make a good definition, the rule should read *adharoshthāntē* for *oshtāntābhyaṁ*.

Of the other treatises (as pointed out in the note to Ath. Pr. i.25), the Vāj. Pr. gives the *v* a description corresponding with this, and showing the letter to have had the precise phonetic value of our English *v*. This, of course, should not in the least stand in the way of our fully recognizing the fact that its original sound was that of our *w*. The *w* is a semi-vowel, standing in the same relation to *u* as *y* to *i*; but to call *v* a semi-vowel is a sim-

42. cakāro ‘jihvāgramadhyapratyaktvam anvādiçati’: lakāre kārye jihvāgramadhyena<sup>2</sup>. dantamūleshu pratyak sparçayet<sup>3</sup>: ayam arthaḥ: lakārasya ‘dantamūlapratyāsannam pratyaganta-rapratdeçasthānam<sup>4</sup> iti vijñeyam<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. *jihvāmadhyān* *pratyaktvān* cā “karshati. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -hvāmadh-. <sup>3</sup> W. B. put after *vijñeyam*. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. -sannapradeṣa *sthānam*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *jñeyam*.

43. vakāre kārye ‘dharoshthāntābhyaṁ uttaradantāgrāih saha sparçayet. dantādir iti-sthānanirdeçah: oshtāntābhyaṁ iti karananirdeçah.

ple abuse of terms. We might nearly as well call our *j* a semi-vowel, because it is written with an originally vocalic sign, and represents in the majority of cases a sound which the Romans pronounced as *y*.

## स्पर्शस्थानेषु भाणा आनुपूर्व्येण ॥४४॥

44. The spirants, in their order, are produced in the places of the mutes.

By rule i.9, there are six spirants, and as there are but five "places" of mutes, these belong to the first five spirants, as is signified by the expression "in their order:" *h*, therefore, is omitted, and its rules will be given hereafter (rules 46, 47). To this effect the commentator, who also allots the spirants to their respective mute-classes, and cites from the *Sanhītā* an example for each: namely, for *jihvāmūliya*, uttered in the place of a *k*-mute, *yah kdmayeta* (ii.3.2<sup>4</sup> et al.: I follow the example of all the MSS., and do not attempt to distinguish the guttural and labial spirants from *visarjanīya* by different signs); for *ç*, in the place of a *c*-mute, *madhuç ca mādhavaç ca* (i.4.14, or iv.4.11<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit the last two words of the citation, and W. reads *manyuç ca*, which is found at iv.7.2<sup>1</sup>); for *sh*, in the place of a *t*-mute, *ashtābhyaḥ svādhā* (vii.2.15); for *s*, in the place of a *t*-mute, *stand uparādh* (vi.2.11<sup>4</sup>); and for *upadhmanīya*, in the place of a *p*-mute, *yah pāpmāṇā* (ii.3.13<sup>2</sup>).

To make this rule a definition of the mode of utterance of the spirants, the one next following is to be applied to modify it. Unfortunately, both together are insufficient to give us any clear idea of the two problematical sounds, *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmanīya*; and there is room for us to suspect them of being, like the long *l*-vowel, an artificial fabrication of the Hindu grammarians. As for the *s*, there is no question as to its value. Nor ought there to be respecting that of the *sh*, which both the explanations of the phonetists and the phenomena of Sanskrit euphony show to have been that particular sibilant (more nearly resembling our *sh* than *s*, but sufficiently distinct from either) which is uttered with the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate. It passes my comprehension how European grammarians should continue to identify

44. *ushmāṇā ānupūrvyena yathākramena sparcasthānesu*  
*'ccārāṇyā bhavanti. yathā: jihvāmūliyah kavargasthāne: yah*  
*k: cakāraç cavargasthāne: madhuç*<sup>2</sup> *----* *: shakāras tavar-*  
*gasthāne: asht*<sup>3</sup> *----* *: sakāras tavargasthāne: stand*<sup>4</sup> *----* *: upa-*  
*dhmāṇyā pavargasthāne: yah p: ity ānupūrvyena: ānupūr-*  
*vyān<sup>4</sup> niyamdt pañcasū "shmasū 'kteshu hakāro vīcīṣṭāh:*  
*tasya vidhim uparishtād dicashte.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *cavargiyas-*; B. *cakāras-*. <sup>2</sup> W. *manyuç*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*vyā vījneyāh*. <sup>4</sup> G. M.  
*vya*. <sup>5</sup> B. -*geshāh*; G. M. *vasishthāh*.

it with our *sh*; and, yet more, how that absurd distinction of the lingual and palatal sibilants (of which, so far as I know, Wilson was the originator) which defines the former as the same with our *sh* in *shun*, and the latter with our *ss* in *session*, can still be repeated in the latest Sanskrit grammars. Absurd I call it, because there is really no difference at all between the pronunciation of *sh* in *shun* and *ss* in *session*. If our *sh* be found in the Sanskrit alphabet, it is the palatal sibilant *c*, not the lingual, *sh*. The question of the value of *c* is connected with and depends upon that of the palatal series of mutes; and upon this I have nothing more to say than I said in the note to Ath. Pr. i.21.

### करणमध्यं तु विवृतम् ॥४५॥

45. But the middle of the producing organ is unclosed.

The “but” (*tu*) of this rule, we are told, is intended to annul (so far) the similarity of organ of the spirants with the mutes. This prescription of an unclosure of the middle of the organ is a rather artificial device for saving the credit of the general prescription of actual contact in all the consonants. It is nearly equivalent with the rules of the Ath. Pr. (i.30,31) upon the same subject.

### काठस्थानौ हकारविसर्जनीयौ ॥४६॥

46. The throat is place of production of *h* and *visarjanîya*.

And, the commentator adds, they have no *karana*, or organ of production. As example of *h*, he cites *aharaha* *havirdhâñindam* (ii.5.6<sup>3</sup>), but leaves *visarjanîya* uninstanced.

The other Pratiçâkhyas give a corresponding definition of the utterance of these two sounds (see note to Ath. Pr. i.19). It is too indefinite to be of any particular use to us in determining their phonetic value. But the two rules which next follow in our treatise are very interesting and instructive.

### उदयस्वरादिस्थानो हकारं एकेषाम् ॥४७॥

47. In the opinion of some authorities, *h* has the same position as the beginning of the following vowel.

Our commentator first offers the simple paraphrase of this rule

45. *teshâm uṣmânâdîm karaṇamadhyam tu vivṛtam bhavati: sparçanâm karaṇasâmyani vṛttiparas<sup>1</sup> tucabduḥ. karaṇâdîm madhyam karaṇamadhyam.*

<sup>1</sup> B. -*ttyarthâm*.

46. *hakâravisarjanîyâu kan̄thasthândâu syâtâm. kan̄tha sthânam yayos tâu tathoktâu. anayoh karaṇâbhâvah. ah-----*

which he finds given by one of his three chief authorities, Vararuci, and then proceeds to exhibit his own superior acuteness by a very long, but not very important, discussion of it: a loose version is as follows:

The expression "the same position as the beginning," etc., implies a difference of position in the remainder of the vowel; but there is none such in *a, i, u*; as a vowel has but a single position, the word "beginning" is superfluous, and the desired result would be secured by saying simply "of the same position with the vowel." That is not so: a difference of position does in fact belong to the remainder of the diphthongs: the two rules (ii.28, 29) which teach that *i* and *u* form the final elements of *di* and *du* assure the difference of position for those two sounds; in like manner, a difference of position is to be remarked as prescribed in general grammar [though not in this treatise] for the final elements of *e* and *o*, they being included in the category of diphthongs. But again: even granting that, the utterance in the throat of this very *a* which makes the initial element of the diphthongs is taught by the rule, "the throat is the place of production of *a*, the *k*-mutes, *h*, and *visarjanīya*"; hence, as sameness of position [with the *a*, as throat-sound] is prescribed by the preceding rule, this rule is open to the charge of superfluous repetition. You must not think so, is the reply; there is a difference between the *a* which forms the beginning of *e* and *o* and an *a* standing by itself: to the latter belongs the description given above in rule 12, "the lips and jaws not too widely separated," etc.; to the other, that of rule 27, "with the organ of production more closed;" therefore, as place and organ correspond to one another, the expression "of the same position as the beginning" is to be understood as meaning "of the same place and organ as the beginning." Moreover, in the former rule the absence of an organ of production was taught, but here is implied also the presence of such; hence a difference of opinions comes to light, and not merely a superfluous repetition.

---

47. *ekeshām mate hakāra<sup>1</sup> udayasvarādisasthāna ātmāna upari svarādisasthāno<sup>2</sup> bhavatī 'ti vārarucoktai<sup>3</sup> syād etat. ādind<sup>4</sup> sasthāna ity ukte ḡeshasya sthāndntaravai<sup>5</sup> vaktuvyai<sup>6</sup> tūd apy akārekārokāreshu nā<sup>7</sup> sti: <sup>8</sup> svarusyādī "kam eva "sthānum" ity adicabdavāiyarthyaṁ syāt: svarasasthāna<sup>9</sup> ity etāvatādī 'vā "rthasiddhir<sup>10</sup> iti: māi<sup>11</sup> 'vam: sandhyakshareshu ḡeshasya<sup>12</sup> sthāndntaropapatteh: ikāro 'dhyardhah (ii.28) iti sūtradvayena ḡeshabhattavarṇavyaktādū<sup>13</sup> tayo<sup>14</sup> sthāndntaram api prasiddham eva: evam<sup>15</sup> ekārāukārayor api vyākaraṇe<sup>16</sup> ḡeshasya sthāndntarai<sup>17</sup> vihitai<sup>18</sup> vijñeyam: sandhyaksharatvāvīcēshādīl anayoh. nanv evam apy akuhavisarjanīyāndām kānṭha iti sundhyakshārādāv akdrasyā 'pi kānṭhasthānatvāt tena samānasthānatve<sup>19</sup> kāthyaṁdāne<sup>20</sup> pūrvasūtroktena<sup>21</sup> pānunaruktyam asya<sup>22</sup> sūtrasya*

Any detailed criticism of this cunning argument would certainly be open to the charge of superfluity, and I shall not attempt it.

A few further examples of the occurrence of *h*, before the various diphthongs, are added: *tigmahete* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>), *yāvatir vāsdmahā* (vii.5.2<sup>1</sup>), *agnihotram juhoti* (i.5.9<sup>1</sup>), *samprayatir ahdu* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>).

The acuteness of observation of the “some authorities” who have made this definition of the character of a *h* certainly deserves respectful, if not admiring, acknowledgment. It is the peculiarity of the aspiration, that it is an emission of unintonated breath through the same position of the mouth organs by which the following intonated sound receives its character: thus, the *h* of *ha* is a surd *a*, so to speak; that of *he*, a surd *e*; that of *who*, a surd *u*; that of *hue*, a surd *y*; and so on (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.370 seq.). The rule would have been made better by reading *udayavarna*, instead of *udayasvarāddī*—‘the following sound,’ instead of ‘the beginning of the following vowel’—for the assimilation is not less true of the semi-vowels and nasals than of the vowels.

## पूर्वात्तसस्थानो विसर्जनीयः ॥४८॥

48. *Visarjaniya* has the same position as the end of the preceding vowel.

The commentator does not tell us whether this definition is to be looked upon as, like the preceding, expressing the opinion of “some authorities,” or as having the unqualified approval of the Prātiçākhyā. From his silence we should infer the latter, but the connection gives reason for presuming the former. He paraphrases: “*visarjaniya* is of like position—that is, of like place and organ—with the end of the vowel that precedes itself;” and adds that

---

*syāt. mādi 'vam mañsthāḥ: ekārduhārādivartino<sup>19</sup> kārasya kevalasya ca viçesho 'sti: kevalasya<sup>20</sup> karanam oshthahanu nā 'tivyastam (ii.12) iti<sup>21</sup>: sandhyaksharāddū vartamānasya tu samvṛtakaranataram (ii.27): tasmāt sthānakaranapayoh saharcaritatvād<sup>22</sup> adisasthāna ity ukta adisamānasthānakaranā<sup>23</sup> iti vijñeyam. kim ca: pūrvasūtre karaṇābhāva ity<sup>24</sup> uktaḥ: atra tu karaṇavattvam api<sup>25</sup> vidyata iti matāntaram upapadyate: na pāunaruktyān ca. tathā<sup>26</sup>: tig: yāv----: agn----: sam----: udayaçabda uttaraparydyah<sup>27</sup>: udayaç cā 'sāu<sup>28</sup> svaraç ca<sup>29</sup> : tasyā "dih: tena sasthānāḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put before *ekeshām*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *udayasvar-*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. *var-*. <sup>4</sup> W. *ādi*.  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. *-tarām*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. *tathā sati*. <sup>(7)</sup> W. 'kashthānam evam. <sup>(8)</sup> B. om.  
<sup>9</sup> G. M. *svarasya sa-*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. *artha*; G. M. *-ddher*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *-bhītañ v-*.  
<sup>12</sup> G. M. *tasyā*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. om. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *-na*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. *sthā-*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *kalpy-*.  
<sup>17</sup> G. M. *-vok-*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *eva tasya*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *-rayor ādi-*. <sup>20</sup> W. ins. *tu*. <sup>21</sup> G. M.  
*nā 'tyupasāñhītañ ca*; B. no 'pasāñhītañ'. <sup>22</sup> W. B. *-ritvād*. <sup>23</sup> W. *-sthāna*.  
<sup>24</sup> G. M. om. <sup>25</sup> G. M. om. <sup>26</sup> G. M. om. <sup>27</sup> G. M. *udayasvarādisasthānah*.  
<sup>28</sup> G. M. om. *asāu*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. ins. *udayasvarah*.

here too the language of the rule is aimed at the diphthongs, since no other vowel exhibits any difference of position between its end and its beginning. His examples, again, are only of *visarjanīya* after a diphthong: they are *agneh* (i.1.10<sup>3</sup> et al.), *brahmaṇdir* *ayushmat* (ii.3.10<sup>3</sup>), *bāhuvar balaṁ* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>), and *ā'yan gāuh* (i.5.3<sup>1</sup>). In the second and third of these passages, only the first word should have been quoted, in order to exhibit the *visarjanīya*.

The teachings of the other Prātiçākhyas respecting the *visarjanīya* are rehearsed in the note to Ath. Pr. i.19. All are so indefinite as really to teach us nothing respecting the phonetic value of the sound. The present rule alone gives us positive and precise information, teaching us to regard it as, like the *h*, a simple uncharacterized breathing, a kind of final *h*.

## नासिक्या नासिकास्थानाः ॥४६॥

49. The nose-sounds have the nose as their place of production.

The "nose-sounds," the commentary says, are the *yamas* (xxi. 12,13); but why the *nāsikya* (xxi.14) should not be regarded as included among them I do not see. Any discussion of their phonetic character may be best deferred until the chapter where the rules for their occurrence are given. As examples of the nose-sounds are quoted *rūkmaṇ antaram* (v.1.10<sup>3</sup>: but G. M. B. give instead *rūkmaṇtam*, ii.2.3<sup>3</sup>), *yācñād* (i.5.7<sup>4</sup>; but G. M. give instead *rājñā*, ii.6.2<sup>2</sup> et al.), *dñndrah* (v.6.5<sup>3</sup>), *ratnam abhajantu* (ii.6.12<sup>1</sup>: but G. M. give instead, if it be not merely a corrupted reading, *ucco ratnam ayajanta*, which I have not found in the *Sanhītā*), and *pāpmāṇam* (i.4.41 et al.).

## मुखनासिक्या वा ॥५०॥

50. Or they are produced by the mouth and nose.

Respecting this alternative explanation nothing need be said at present.

48. *visarjanīya āmanah pūrvasvarāntena sasthānah sumdnasthānakarāṇo bhavati*: *atṛā'pi pūrvasvara iti sandhyaksharam ucyate*: *svarāntarasya<sup>1</sup> hi<sup>2</sup> sthānāntaratrdbhāvāt*. *yathā*: *ag-*<sup>3</sup> *brāh-----*: *bāh-----*<sup>4</sup> *ā-----* *pūrvasyā'ntāḥ*: *tena sasthānah pūrvāntasasthānah*<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -*ntasya*. <sup>2</sup> B. om; G. M. *bhinna*. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> B. om. <sup>5</sup> B. om.

49. *nāsikyā yamā nāsikāsthānā bhavanti*. *yathā*: *ruk-----*: *yāt*: *at*: *rat-----*: *pāp-*.

50. *ta<sup>1</sup> eva nāsikyā mukhānāsikādbhyām<sup>2</sup> uccāraṇīyāt bhavanti*. *mukham ca nāsikā<sup>3</sup> ca mukhānāsike<sup>4</sup>*: *tatsambandhino mukhānāsikydh*. *'uktāny evo 'dāharanāndī'*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eta*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *mukhena nāsikādbhyām ca*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*ke*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*kam*. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. put after *bhavanti*.

## वर्गविद्येषु ॥५१॥

51. And, in them, the organ of production is as in the series of mutes.

The “and” (*ca*) of this rule, the commentator says, brings forward, on the principle of ‘the lion’s look’ (a distant glance backward: the phrase is used several times later in like cases), the already defined organs of production of the various mute series.

If the mouth be regarded as bearing a part in the production of the nose-sounds or *yamas*, in a way which is determined by the mode of formation of the mutes to which they are attached, it is difficult to see how their number can be restricted to four, as it is in the “list of sounds” given at the beginning of the treatise, and in the comment on rule xxi.12.

## नासिकाविवरणादानुनासिक्यं नासिकाविवरणादानु- नासिक्यम् ॥५२॥

52. Nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nose.

*Anunāsikya* is the quality of being *anunāsika* or ‘nasal;’ and this name, as prescribed by rule 30, above, and fully supported by the usage of the treatise elsewhere, belongs to *anusvāra* and the various nasal consonants. The definition of the manner in which the quality is communicated is quite unexceptionable; the organs of the mouth remaining in the positions already given for the various classes and single sounds, the opening of the nasal passage, and the utterance through it of a part or the whole of the emitted material, makes the corresponding nasal sound.

The commentator explains *nāsikāvivarana* by *ghrānabila*, ‘hole of the nose, nasal passage,’ as if *vivarana* signified the opening or cavity, instead of the act of opening or unclosing. His choice of an example also seems to betray a want of appreciation of the true scope of the rule: it is *suglokāśñ sumāngaldśñ* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>).

51. *sinhāvalokanena*<sup>1</sup> *vargasyo ktam karaṇam cakāro nukar-*  
*shati: eshu*<sup>2</sup> *nāsikyeshu vargavat karaṇam bhavati. vargasye*  
*va vargavat.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *kananyāyena*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. (as also in the text of the rule itself) *eteshu*.

52. *nāsikāvivaranād ghrānabilād anunāsikyaiñ raṅgādi kar-*  
*tavyam. yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *su-*—*ity ādi.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhya-vivarane*  
*dvitīyo ‘dhyāyah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *nāsikāb-*. <sup>2</sup> B. *tathā*; W. om.

## CHAPTER III.

CONTENTS: 1, introductory; 2-6, cases of *a* at the end of the first member of a compound, requiring to be shortened in divided text; 7, of *i* and *u*; 8-12, of final *a* of verbal forms and particles; 13-14, of final *i* and *u*; 15, of initial *a*.

### अथादावुत्तरे विभागे ह्रस्वं व्यञ्जनपरः ॥१॥

1. Now then—at the beginning or end of a word, a vowel, in case of separation, if followed by a consonant, becomes short as hereinafter set forth.

Matters of introductory explanation, of interpretation of the rules of the treatise, and of phonetic theory, being now for the present disposed of (for they are resumed, in a supplementary way, in some of the concluding chapters), the task of determining the readings of the *Sanhitā* is taken up. And the first subject dealt with is that of the irregular prolongations of vowels—chiefly final *a*, *i*, and *u*—which are so frequent in all the Vedic texts. In the other treatises (*Rik Pr.* vii.-ix., *Vāj. Pr.* iii.95-128, *Ath. Pr.* iii.1-25), the rules tell us in what situations a vowel originally short is lengthened: this is more in accordance with the general method of the *Prātiçākhyas*, which take for granted, upon the whole, the existence of their *cákhás* in the analyzed condition of the *pada*-text, and proceed to construct the *sanhitā* from it. Here, on the contrary, we are told what vowels, long in the ordinary text, are to be shortened when thrown out of combination with their surroundings. Such dissolution of the continuity of the text takes place, first, in *pada*, whenever a pause—either the *avagraha* separating the two members of a compound, in its repetition after *iti*, or the longer pause that divides between two words—comes to stand between the vowel in question and the consonant which was its next neighbor in *sanhitā*: thus, *devdyata iti deva-yate*; *ava-nah* (s. *avā nah*). Second, it is made in the so-called *jatā*-text, examples of which are often quoted in the sequel, and to which the rules of the treatise are in more than one instance adapted; this text is constructed by thrice repeating each pair of words—first in

---

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: adū padāddv uttare padānte ca vartamānah sanhitāyām yo dīrgho 'sdu vibhāge vībhāgasamaye vyāñjanaparo hruṣvam āpadyate:*<sup>1</sup> *vyāñjanaparatvām<sup>2</sup> atra ya-thāsanhitāsthām vīneyam. nanu dīrghaḥ kathām labhyate.*  
*"hrasvānantarabhdvitvād devaçīkā* (iii.2). "digrahañeshu plutā-  
 darçanāc ce' 'ti brūmaḥ. *sanhitāyām ity asyā 'yam arthaḥ:*  
*kāryabhdjah padasyo 'ttarapadena saha sambandhanīyamah<sup>3</sup>:*  
*na tu pūrvapadena saha sambandhanīyamah<sup>4</sup>. vibhāgo 'tra*

their natural order, then inverted, then in the natural order again: for example, *apo heshtā mayobhuvaḥ* would become *apo hi hy āpa apo hi: hi shṭha sthā hi hi shṭha: sthā mayobhuvo mayo-bhuva sthā sthā mayobhuvaḥ: mayobhuva iti mayah-bhuvaḥ*: the treatment of the *ā* of *sthā* here illustrates the conditions of the restoration of the short vowel in such cases. Third, the same restoration takes place in the *sāṁhitā*-text of the existing manuscripts and in the edition founded upon them, when the lengthened vowel happens to come at the end of one of those passages, of just fifty words each, into which the *anuvākas* or sections of the *Sāṁhitā* are divided. This division the Prātiçākhyā does not recognize—or, at any rate, does not notice—not infrequently quoting in *sāṁdhi*, without remark, words which are separated by it (for example, under rule 13, below, *uṣmāsi gamadhye*, i.3.6<sup>1-2</sup>, where the edited text reads correctly *uṣmāsi: 1: gamadhye*).

The comment upon this rule may be loosely translated, or paraphrased, as follows:

Here *atha*, ‘now then,’ is an introductory heading; *ddāu* [literally, ‘at the beginning’] means ‘at the beginning of a word’ [including, also, a separable part of a compound word]; *uttare* [literally, ‘in the latter part’] means ‘at the end of a word.’ A vowel occupying such a position, if it be long in *sāṁhitā*, becomes short *vibhāge*, i. e. ‘in case of separation,’ when followed by a consonant—that is to say, when so followed in *sāṁhitā*. But whence is derived the limitation to a “long” vowel? We answer, from its conversion into a short, and from the non-occurrence of any protracted (*pluta*) vowels among the instances included in the rules. The limitation “in *sāṁhitā*” implies that the word whose form is in question is placed in euphonic connection with the word that follows it; not, however, with the word that precedes it [unless, as should be excepted, its initial vowel, instead of its final, is the one liable to change of quantity]. “Separation” (*vibhāga*) is to be understood as division from the words with which it stands in natural or original connection—that is, according to the reading of the fundamental text: otherwise, in the *jāṭa*-text of the two words *sthā mayobhuvaḥ* (see above), the *sthā* would retain its long *ā* in its second repetition, because of its standing in euphonic connection with the following word: and that should not be so. The sense of the word *vibhāga* is, in case of a long initial vowel, separation from the preceding word; in case of a long final, from the

---

*prakṛtipadādir ucyate: prakṛtir nāma yathāpāthah: prakṛtipadādir iti kim: sthā m- ity atra jāṭyāmīn sthaśabdasya dvitīyoccdraṇe 'pi dīrghāḥ prasajyeta': uttarapadena vibhāgābhāvāt: sa<sup>a</sup> mā bhād iti pariḥārah. vibhāgapadasyā 'yam arthaḥ: padāddāu<sup>10</sup> dīrghasya pūrvapadena vibhāgāḥ: padāntē<sup>11</sup> dīrghasyo 'ttarapadena vibhāgāḥ. vibhāge vyañjanapara iti kim: rt---- ity atra mā bhād iti: nādhāmādharayāt (iii.8) iti prāptih. sāṁhitāyāmī<sup>12</sup> dīrgha iti kim: esha---- ity atra prāptisampādanārtham:*

following word. The limitation “in case of separation, if followed by a consonant” is for the sake of excluding such cases as *ṛtadhā-mā’si* (i.3.3 : in separated form, *ṛtadhāmā. asi*), which would otherwise come under the rule iii.8 [among the specifications of which, *dhamā* is included]. The limitation “a long vowel in *samhitā*” is intended to bring *esha vo bharatārājā* (i.8.10<sup>2</sup> et al.; *pada*-text, *bharatādhā*) under the action of the rules; since thus, and not otherwise, is pertinence given to the word *yājyād* in rule 11 of this chapter. Undue extension of the prescription to such cases as *trā vāyavāḥ* (i.1.1) is provided against by the rules that follow [since these specify all the cases in which it is to be applied].

The only difficulty arising in connection with the understanding of this rule, or of the interpretation of it given by the commentator, grows out of the specification *vyañjanapara*, ‘followed by a consonant.’ Respecting this, we are explicitly told, near the beginning of the exposition, “the being followed by a consonant is to be understood here of the condition of things in the *samhitā*-text”—that is to say, any long vowel which appears in *samhitā* as a final, with a consonant following it, is to be regarded as falling under the rules of the chapter. This specification, then, makes the rules apply to such cases as *bharatā rājā* (the example quoted by the commentator: the *pada*-reading is *bharatādhā*: *rājā*) and *adha mā* (quoted under rule 9; *pada*-reading *adhadhā*: *mā*), and they have to be specially allowed for and excepted—as is done in rules 9 and 11. It seems very strange, now, to have this implication made, requiring as a consequence that all the words which by euphonic processes come to exhibit in *samhitā* a long final vowel (*a*) should be taken into consideration: but the number of cases actually needing to be guarded against in the rules on account of it is very small. For, in the first place, the question can arise only in regard to the words specially mentioned in the rules; and among these there are not many for which homophonous forms in *āh* or *āī* occur; and of these, again, only a part would occur otherwise than before a vowel, in which situation the hiatus would betray the omission of the former final element. The makers of the treatise, then, appear to have thought it safer to avoid a possible confusion of *adha* from *adhdā* with *adhdā* from *adha*, and so on, by making the rules apply in general to both cases, and specially excepting the former. And this is what they have attempted to do: and it has cost them only two additional words—*agniyājye* in rule 9, and *yājyādsu* in rule 11—together with an artifice of

---

*tathā sati bharatā yājyādsu* (iii.11) *iti yājyāpadāśi sārthakam  
nā ’nyathā. vyañjanam asmāt param<sup>13</sup> iti vyañjanaparāḥ.  
tvā . . . ity ādāv etallakshanasambhavād<sup>14</sup> ativyāptim<sup>15</sup> uttarā-  
sūtrādiḥ pariharati.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *padādiū ca padānte ca yo dirgho vyañjanotaro vibhāge kriyamāne  
hrasvām samyāti.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. -nam. <sup>(3)</sup> M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. *hrasvānt-* <sup>5</sup> G. om. *ca.* <sup>6</sup> G.  
M. -*dhāk.* <sup>7</sup> W. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. -*yate.* <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. -*gaçabd-* <sup>10</sup> W.  
-*ddāi.* <sup>11</sup> W. -*nta.* <sup>12</sup> G. M. ins. *yo.* <sup>13</sup> G. M. -*ra.* <sup>14</sup> G. M. *eva tal-* <sup>15</sup> W. *atiprā-*

construction under rule 8, in connection with the word *prāṇḍh*. Without a complete *index verborum* to the Sanhitā, or a laboriously minute examination of the whole text with reference to this particular point, I cannot tell just how nearly successful their attempt has been; but I have, I believe, discovered at least one case which they have overlooked. At i.4.24, namely, we read *rakṣhā mākiḥ* (p. *rakshāḥ*), and, by rule 8, the *a* of *rakṣhā* should be shortened. That the section containing these words was really a part of the text for which the Prātiçākhya was constructed is proved by the fact that two of its peculiarities of reading are provided for in later rules (vi.5 and xi.13).

But with the interpretation thus given appears to be quite at variance the phrase containing the illustration *ṛtadhāmā'si*, where *vibhāge* and *vyañjanaparāḥ* are immediately connected, and made to mean 'followed by a consonant in separated text' (not *ṛtadhāmā: asi*). This I can hardly believe to be a genuine part of the commentary. The second *a* of *ṛtadhāmā'si* cannot be said to be either final or initial: it is a combination of both: it does not furnish a case to which the rules of the chapter apply with any propriety, as the *samhitā* reading cannot be affected by them. If not some later meddler, then the commentator himself, has suffered himself to be scared by an imaginary difficulty, and has unnecessarily twisted the rule a little awry in order to its removal.

The specification *vibhāge*, 'in case of separation,' applies in the Tāittirīya *pada*-text more generally and more strictly than in those of the other Vedas. Where the separation of a compound is suspended on account of its further composition, the restoration of its natural form is suspended also; and we read, for example, *vir-yā-vat*, but *viryāvata-tara*; *vicva-mitra*, but *vicvāmitra-jamadagni*; *anu-yāja* and *anānu-yāja*, but *prayājā-anāyāja*, and so on—and we shall find illustrations hereafter in connection with other changes than prolongation of vowels. Thus, also, in the full *pada*-readings, the word is given first, before *iti*, in its *samhitā* form, without change (except euphonic combination with the *iti*); and this part of the reading I shall accordingly usually omit in quoting the *pada*-text, setting down only the separated and restored form which follows *iti*, or the part which corresponds to the entire reading of the Rik and Atharvan *pada*-texts.

## देवाशीकासुम्नार्थतावयुनाकृदयोक्याम्रग्जा ॥ २ ॥

2. *Devā, ṣikā, sumnā, ḡvā, ṛtā, vuyunā, hrdayā, aghā,*

2. .... *ity eteshu grahaneshu avagraheshv<sup>1</sup> antyasvaro vibhāge vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: dev----*  
*ṣik----*: *sumn----*: *dyāv----*: <sup>2</sup>*apy akarādi* (i.52) *iti vacanād idam apy udāharanam<sup>4</sup>: a ḡv----*: *ṛt----*: *vay----*<sup>3</sup>  
*hrd----*: *agh----*: *ukth----*: *apo----*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> B. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *sūtrād* <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-hartavyam*.

*ukthā*, and *guddhā*, as first members of a compound, shorten their final when separated.

This and the following rules, including the seventh, properly form one connected passage, with the specification *ity avagrahah*, 'these, as former members of a compound,' which applies alike to them all, standing at the end.

The examples quoted from the *Sanhita* in illustration of the rule are as follows. For *devā*: *devdyate yujamāndya carma* (iii.5.5<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word of the citation), the only case, so far as I have noted, for *devayant*; we have *devayate* (with short vowel) twice, at i.2.12<sup>3</sup> and ii.5.9<sup>3</sup>; *devdyuvam* occurs ii.5.9<sup>6</sup> and iv.1.1<sup>3</sup>, but *devayuh*, iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>. For *śikā*, *śikdyate svādhā* (vii.5.11<sup>2</sup>), the only case. For *sumnd*, *sumndyanto havāmahe* (i.5.11<sup>4</sup>), also alone. For *cvā*, *dyāvāprthivyā cvāvit* (v.5.20): *cvā*, however, by rule i.52, includes *acvā*, for which is quoted *acvāvatīn somavatīm* (iv.2.6<sup>4</sup>); I have noted farther only iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>, but feel less than usual confidence in the completeness of my excerptation. For *ṛtā*, *ṛtāyavah purā 'nnam akshan* (ii.2.5<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit the last word of the citation): there are more than twenty such cases in the text, for the themes *ṛtāyu* (e. g. i.4.5: but *ṛtayu* once, ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>), *ṛtāyant* (e. g. iv.2.9<sup>3</sup>), *ṛtāvan* (e. g. i.3.14<sup>2</sup>) and its feminine *ṛtāvarī* (e. g. i.1.3), *ṛtāvr̥dh* (e. g. i.4.5), and *ṛtāsah* (iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>: but this word reads in *pada* as in *samhitā*). For *vayund*, *vayunāvid eka it* (i.2.13<sup>1</sup> and iv.1.1<sup>1</sup>). For *ṛ̥dayā*, *ṛ̥dayāvīdhaḥ cit* (i.4.45<sup>1</sup>). For *aghā*, *aghāyavo mā gandharvo viṣvāvasur ādadhat* (i.2.9: G. M. omit after *gandharvah*): other cases of *aghāyu* are found at iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>: iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>; 5.10<sup>4</sup>; v.7.3<sup>1</sup>; and of *aghāyant*, ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>. For *ukthā*, *ukthāmadāññī dhenuh* (ii.4.11<sup>6</sup>): the same compound occurs again at iii.3.2<sup>1</sup> and v.6.8<sup>6</sup>, and *ukthāyū* at i.4.12, twice. For *gudhā*, *āpo devīḥ guddhāyuvah* (i.3.8<sup>2</sup> and vi.3.8<sup>4</sup>).

### इन्द्रा वदन्वान्परः ॥३॥

3. Also *indrā*, when followed by *vat*, *van*, and *vān*.

One example is quoted by the commentator for each of the three cases enumerated: *indrāvatīm apacitīm ihā "vaha* (v.7.4<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit after *apacitīm*), *indrāvanto marutah* (iv.7.14<sup>1</sup>), and *indrādvānt svādhā* (i.1.12); and I have noted no others. As counter-examples, he quotes: first, to show that not every long *a* is to be shortened before the three syllables named, *ārṇāvantam prathamah sida yonim* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. give only the first two words), *asura prajāvān* (iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>: but B. reads, I presume only by an

3. *indre 'ty asminn' avagrahe 'ntyasvaro vad van vān ity evamparo vibhāge hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: in d-----: in d-----: in d----- indre 'ti kim: ārṇ-----: as-----: praj----- evampara iti kim: in d-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. etasminn. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

error, *pratāpavān*), and *prajāvratār anamīvā ayakshmādā* (i.1.1: but omitted in G. M.); second, to show that *indrā* is not altered except under the circumstances specified, *indrāvarunayor aham* (ii.5.12<sup>2</sup>). This last is a case in which no *vibhāga*, or 'separation,' would be made in any text of the other Vedas; but the Tāittiriya *pada* reads *indrāvarunayor iti 'ndrā-varunayoh*, and the example is therefore to the purpose.

## चित्रा वपरः ॥४॥

4. Also *citrā*, when followed by *v*.

The illustrative passage cited is *citrāvaso svasti te pāram aṣīya* (i.5.5<sup>4</sup> and 7<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit after *te*). As counter-examples, are given *mitrāvarunādv eva* (ii.1.7<sup>3</sup> et al.: p. *mitrā-varunādu*), and *citrāpārnāmāse dīksheraṇ* (vii.4.8<sup>2</sup>)—the former to show the necessity of the restriction to *citrā*, the latter, of the restriction to sequence by a *v*. I have found no farther instances falling under the rule.

प्रस्थेन्द्रियाङ्गविणाविश्वदेव्यादीर्घावीर्याविश्वावातावा-  
भङ्गुरकर्णकावृणियासुगोपर्कसामाधासत्रावर्षाष्पूष्यामे-  
धाप्रास्वा ॥५॥

5. Also *prasthā*, *indriyā*, *dravīnā*, *viçvadevyā*, *dirghā*, *viryā*, *viçvā*, *vātā*, *tvā*, *bhaṅgurā*, *karnakā*, *vṛṣṇiyā*, *sugopā*, *rksāmā*, *aghā*, *satrā*, *varshā*, *pushpā*, *meghā*, *prā*, *suā*.

For each of these words, the commentator cites a single example. For *prasthā*, *prasthāvad rathavāhanam* (iv.2.5<sup>6</sup>), the only case. For *indriyā*, *indriyāvate puroḍācam* (ii.2.7<sup>1</sup>): half a dozen cases of this word occur in the text, and several of *indriyāvin* (e. g. i.6.2<sup>4</sup>: ii.1.6<sup>3</sup>: vi.2.10<sup>6</sup>); the latter word, however, is not separated in the *pada*-text. For *dravīnā*, *dravīndvataḥ kurute* (v.3.11<sup>2</sup>), the only case. For *viçvadevyā*; *viçvadevyāvate ṣvātrāḥ* (i.4.1<sup>1</sup>): the word occurs also at iv.1.6<sup>1,2</sup>. For *dirghā*, *dirghāddhiyo rakshamāndh* (ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>), the only case. For *viryā*, *viryāvantam abhimāti-  
shāham* (i.2.7): the same theme is found in other passages, as are also its comparative, *viryāvat-tara* (e. g. i.7.6<sup>3</sup>), and superlative, *viryāvat-tama* (ii.4.2<sup>1</sup>), in which the shortening of the *ā* is not authorized by the Prātiçākhya, since, in the division, it does not stand next before the pause: and the *pada*-text reads accordingly. For *viçvā*, *viçvāmitrasya sūktam bhavati* (v.2.3<sup>3-4</sup>: G. M. omit

---

4. *citrā ity asminn<sup>1</sup> avagrahe 'nityasvaro vakāraparo<sup>2</sup> vibhāge  
hrasvam āpadyate. yathā<sup>3</sup>: cit----- citre 'ti kim: mitr-----:  
vapara iti kim: citr-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. etasminn. <sup>2</sup> G. M. vap-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

the last word): the same word occurs in other passages (iv.3.2<sup>2</sup>: v.2.3<sup>3,4</sup>, 10<sup>5</sup>; 4.2<sup>2</sup>), as also in the compound *vigvāmitrājamadagnī* (v.4.11<sup>3</sup>), where, as the division is *vigvāmitrājamadagnī*, the *d* is not shortened; and we have further the themes *vigvāvasu* (e. g. i.1.11<sup>1</sup>), *vigvāvant* (iii.5.6<sup>2</sup>), *vigvārāj* (i.3.2<sup>1</sup>), and *vigvāsah* (i.4.17; p. *vigva-saham*). For *vātā*, *vātāvad varshān* (ii.4.7<sup>1</sup>), the only case. For *tva*, *tvāvato maghōnah* (ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>; p. *tva-vatah*): the Rik *pada*-text does not shorten the *a* of this word. For *bhañgurā*, *bhetṭāram bhañgurāvatah* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> and iv.1.2<sup>5</sup>). For *karnākā*, *sūrmi karnakāvaty etayā* (i.5.7<sup>6</sup> and v.4.7<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the first word, W. B. the last). For *vr̄shṇiyād*, *vr̄shṇiyāvatas tava* (iii. 5.6<sup>2-3</sup>). For *sugopā*, *sa sugopātamo janāh* (iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>; p. *sugopā-tamah*: G. M. omit the first word): the Rik *pada* writes *su-gopā-tamah*. For *rksāmā*, *rksāmābhyyām yajushā* (i.2.3<sup>3</sup> and iii.1.1<sup>4</sup>). For *aghā*, *aghācūḍ evāi 'nam antar eti bhātam* (iii.1.7<sup>2</sup>; p. *aghā-cūḍ*: G. M. omit the last two words); the Rik and Atharvan *pada*-texts write *agha-agva*: the themes *aghāyu* (e. g. i.2.9<sup>1</sup>) and *aghā-yant* (ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>) are also found in the Samhitā. For *satrā*, *satrājitam dhanajitam* (iv.1.1<sup>3</sup>; p. *satra-jitam*: the word *satrā* occurs repeatedly (e. g. i.6.12<sup>1</sup>) uncompounded, and maintains its long final in the *pada*-text also. For *varshā*, *varshāhvāṁ juhoti* (ii.4.10<sup>3</sup>; p. *varsha-hvāṁ*). For *pushpā*, *pushpavatih supippalāḥ* (iv.1.4<sup>4</sup> and v.1.5<sup>10</sup>). For *meghā*, *meghāyate svādhā* (vii.5.11<sup>1</sup>; p. *megha-yate*; in the same division occurs also *meghāyishyate*, which is not divided: *meghāyanti* is found at iv.4.5<sup>1</sup>). For *prā*, *prāvanebhīḥ sajoshasah* (iv.2.4<sup>3</sup>; p. *prā-vanebhīḥ*); the Rik *pada*-text writes this word *pravāna*, without separation: other words beginning with *prā* are *prāśuh* (e. g. i.3.14<sup>6</sup>; p. *pra-sahā*), *prāgrīga* (ii.1.3<sup>4,5</sup>), *prāsaca* (vii.5.11<sup>1</sup>; not divided in *pada*-text), *prākāca* (i.8.18; also not divided), and *prāvṛta* (iv.6.2<sup>2</sup> et al.; also not divided). And for *svā*, *svādhiyam janayat sūdayac ca* (i.3.14<sup>6</sup>; p. *sva-dhi-yam*): but this the Rik *pada*-text writes *su-dhyum*.

## लोकैवेष्टा ॥ ६ ॥

### 6. Also *ishtā*, after *loke* and *eva*.

The commentator cites the two cases: *sam amushmin loka ishtāpārtena* (iii.8.8<sup>5</sup> twice: G. M. omit the first word), and *sa tv eve 'shtāpārti* (i.7.3<sup>3</sup>; p. *ishta-pārti*). Then, to show that *ishtā* after other words remains unchanged, he quotes *prati jāgrhy enam ishtāpārte sañ srjethām ayam ca* (iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>; p. *ishta-pārte*: W. B.

5. .... ity eteshv avagraheshv antyasvuro vibhāge ḫyanjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: pras---: in dr---: drav---: viçv---: dīr---: vīr---: viçv---: vāt---: tvā---: bhetṭ---: sūr---: vr̄sh---: sa---: rks---: agh---: satr---: varsh---: pushp---: megh---: prāv---: svā---

omit before *enam*, G. M. after *pūrte*); and the same mode of treatment is followed by the *pada*-text at v.7.7<sup>2</sup>, which is the only other case I have noted. The ground of this difference does not appear. To show, further, that only *ishtā* shortens its *a* in the defined position, the passage *sākshād eva prajāpataye* (v.1.2<sup>5</sup>) is given.

शक्तीरथीविषीवाशीरत्रोषध्याङ्गतीव्याकृतिस्वाक्षा-  
कृतीङ्गाङ्गनीशचीचितीश्रोणीपृष्ठीपूत्यभीचर्षणीपर्यधीपा-  
रीशत्रूविषूवसूअनूहनूसूविभू इत्यवयहः ॥७॥

7. Also *çaktī*, *rathī*, *tvishi*, *vāçī*, *rātri*, *oshadhī*, *āhutī*, *vyāhṛti*, *svāhākṛti*, *hrādunī*, *gacī*, *citi*; *groni*, *prṣṭī*, *pūti*, *abhi*, *carshanī*, *parī*, *adhi*, *pārī*, *çatrū*, *vishū*, *vasū*, *arū*, *hanū*; *sū*, *vibhū*—all these, as first members of a compound.

To the passages cited by the commentator I add, as above, notice of other cases which I have found in the text. For *çaktī*, the sole instance is *çaktivanto gabhrīdh* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>). For *rathī*, *rathītamāu rathīnām* (iv.7.15<sup>3</sup>). For *tvishi*, *saspīñjariya tvishīmate pathīnām* (iv.5.2<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit the last word, G. M. the first). For *vāçī*, *te vāçīmanta ishminah* (ii.1.11<sup>2</sup> and iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *rātri*, *rātribhir asubhnān* (ii.4.1<sup>1</sup>): if there are other cases, I have failed to note them. For *oshadhī*, *oshadhībhyo vehatam alabbeta* (ii.1.5<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): I have noted half a dozen other cases, but they are not worth reporting. For *āhutī*, *āhutībhīr anyājeshu* (ii.6.9<sup>4</sup>). For *vyāhṛti*, *etdbhīr vyāhṛtībhīh* (i.6.10<sup>2</sup> and v.5.5<sup>3</sup>). For *svāhākṛti*, *svāhākṛti-bhyah preshye 'ty aha* (vi.3.9<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words). For *hrādunī*, *svāhā hrādunībhyah svāhā* (vii.4.13: G. M. omit the first word, W. B. the last). For *gacī*, *vicvā rāpā 'bhi cashte gacī-bhīh* (iv.2.5<sup>4-5</sup>: W. B. omit before *cashte*). For *citi*, *citi-bhyām upāyan* (v.7.5<sup>7</sup>). For *groni*, *groni-bhyām svāhā* (vii.3.16<sup>2</sup>): another case is found at v.7.15. For *prṣṭī*, W. B. give *prṣṭībhīr divam* (v.7.17), but G. M. read *prṣṭībhīyah svāhā* (vii.3.16<sup>1</sup>). For *pūti*, *pātīgandhasyā 'pahatyāi* (ii.2.2<sup>4</sup>). For *abhi*, *abhi-vrto ghrnī-vāni cetati tmanā* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words): we have also *abhi-shah* at ii.3.2<sup>6</sup> (p. *abhi-sahī*). For *carshanī*, *mitrasya carshanīdhrītah* (iii.4.11<sup>5</sup> and iv.1.6<sup>3</sup>): another case at i.4.18. For *parī*, *vīravantam parīnasam* (ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>; p. *parī-nasam*: compare rule vii.4). For *adhi*, *adhi-vāsam yā hiranyāny asmāi* (iv.6.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *pārī*, *pārīnahyasye 'ge* (vi.2.1<sup>1</sup>; p. *pārī-nahyasya*: compare rule vii.4). For *çatrū*, *ca-*

6. *loke*: *eva*: *ity evampūrva ishṭe 'ty asmin' grahaṇe<sup>3</sup> 'ntyā-svaro vibhāge vyanjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: sam----*  
*sa----- evampūrva iti kim: prati----: ishṭe 'ti kim: sāk-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. etasmīnn. <sup>2</sup> G. M. avagrahe.

*trāyato hantā* (i.6.5<sup>3</sup> and iv.2.1<sup>2</sup>). For *vishū*, *vishūvān* *vishūvan-tah* (vii.4.3<sup>4</sup>): another case at vii.4.8<sup>2</sup>. For *vasū*, *aramatir vasū-yuh* (iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>). For *anū*, *anūrddha* *nakshatram* (iv.4.10<sup>2</sup>); we have it also in the compounds *anuyāja* (e. g. ii.6.9<sup>4</sup>), *anūbandhiya* (e. g. ii.2.9<sup>7</sup>), *anukṛca* (e. g. v.4.1<sup>3</sup>), and *anūvṛj* (v.7.23). In the further compound of the first, *prayājānāyāja* (e. g. i.7.1<sup>1</sup>; p. *prāyāja-anuyājānā*), the shortening is not authorized, since in it there is no division after *anū*. Appealing to rule i.53 as his authority, the commentator adds, as contemplated by the present rule, *anānū-yājam* *prāyanīyam* (vi.1.5<sup>3</sup>; p. *anānū-yājam*). For *hanū*, *hanū-bhyāñ svādhā* (vii.3.16<sup>1</sup>). For *sū*, *sūyavasini manave yaçasye* (i.2.13<sup>2</sup>): *sūyavasa* occurs more than once (e. g. i.7.5<sup>2,3</sup>). For *vibhā*, *vibhūddhvne* (iii.5.8,9<sup>2</sup>).

The commentator notes that the specification at the end of this rule defines the whole mass of words thus far enumerated as collectively *avagraha* (i.49), ‘first members of compounds.’

अवासचस्वानुदामृडावर्धाशिक्षारक्षायाभवाभजायत्रा-  
चरपिबानाधामाधारयाधर्षावर्धयाबोधत्रातत्रामुच्चाश्व-  
स्यापृणास्वाक्षिष्ठावंतरजनिष्ठायद्वाक्षा ॥ ८ ॥

8. Also *ava*, *sacasvā*, *nudā*, *mṛḍā*, *vardhā*, *çikshā*, *rakshā*, *adyā*, *bhavā*, *bhajā*, *yatrā*, *carā*, *pibā*, *nā*, *dhāmā*, *dhārayā*, *dharshā*, *ghā*, *vardhayā*, *bodhā*, *aṭrā*, *tatrā*, *muñcā*, *açvasyā*, *prṇasvā*, *hi* *shṭhā*, *tvāṁ tarā*, *janishvā*, *yukshvā*, *achā*.

Henceforth we have to do only with independent words, the category of *avagrahas*, or former members of compounds, having been exhausted by the foregoing rules. There is cited in illustration, for *avā*, *avā no devyā kṛpā* (iv.1.4<sup>1</sup>). For *sacasvā*, *sacasvā nah svastaye* (i.5.6<sup>2</sup>). For *nudā*, *pra nudā nah sapatnān* (iv.3.12<sup>1</sup> thrice, and v.3.5<sup>1</sup>). For *mṛḍā*, W. B. give *mṛḍā jaritre* (iv.5.10<sup>4</sup>), but G. M. read *mṛḍā no rudra* (iv.5.10<sup>2</sup>): I have noted no other case. For *vardhā*, *vardhā no amavac chavaḥ* (ii.6.11<sup>3</sup>). For *çik-*

7. .... *ity eteshu avagraheshu* *antyasvaro vibhāge vyanjanaparo hrasvam ḍapadyate. yathā: çak-....: rath-....: sa-....: te-....: rā-....: ḍsh-....: ḍh-....: et-....: svā-....: svāhā-....: viç-....: cit-....: gro-....: prsh-....: pūt-....: abh-....: mitr-....: vīr-....: adh-....: pār-....: çatr-....: vish-....: ar-....: anū-....: ankārādi ca<sup>2</sup> (i.53) iti vacanād<sup>3</sup> anan-.... *ity etad* <sup>4</sup> *udāharanām bhavati: han-....: sūy-....: vibh-....: ity avagraha ity anena prakāreno 'ktih<sup>5</sup> pcadasam-udāye<sup>6</sup> 'vagraho vīñeyah<sup>7</sup>.**

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *sūtrāt*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *apy*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. 'ktih. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *muccayah*. <sup>7</sup> B. *viçeshah*.

*shā, cikshā no asmin puruhāta yāmani* (vii.5.7<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit the last two words): it is found again at iv.6.2<sup>5</sup>. For *rakshā, rakshā ca no adhi ca deva brāhi* (iv.5.10<sup>3</sup> and vii.5.24; G. M. omit the last two words): the form occurs also at ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>. I have pointed out in the note to the first rule of the chapter that a passage (i.4.24) in which *rakshā* appears as euphonic alteration of *rakshāḥ* before a sonant consonant ought to be somehow excepted here. For *adyā, adyā devāñ jushtatamah* (iv.6.7<sup>5</sup>): also at ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: iii.4.11<sup>2</sup>: iv.6.2<sup>6</sup>. For *bhavā, bhavā pāyur vigo asyā adabdhāḥ* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words): other cases are not infrequent; see i.1.14<sup>4</sup>; 4.32; iii.2.5<sup>3</sup>; 4.10<sup>1</sup>: iv.1.7<sup>2</sup>; 2.5<sup>1</sup>, 7<sup>4</sup>; 4.4<sup>7</sup>; and likewise ii.6.12<sup>1</sup>, where *bhavā*, standing at the end of the first division of the *anuvāka*, is situated *vibhāge*, and loses its *a* even in the *sāṁhitā*-text. For *bhajā, a gomati vrāje bhajā tvam nāḥ* (i.6.12<sup>1</sup>: W. B. begin at *vrāje*): another case at iii.3.9<sup>2</sup>. For *yatrā, yatrā naro marutāḥ* (iii.1.11<sup>8</sup>): other cases at iv.4.4<sup>1</sup>; 6.6<sup>4</sup>, 7<sup>2</sup>. For *carā, pra carā soma duryān* (i.2.10<sup>1</sup>). For *pibā, pibā somam indra mandatu* (ii.4.14<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): another case at i.4.19. For *nā, ripavo nā ha debhūḥ* (i.2.14<sup>5-6</sup>): in connection with this word, the commentator runs off into a lengthy discussion, which I defer to the end of the note. For *dhāmā, dhāmā ha yat te ajara* (iii.1.11<sup>6</sup>): we have *dhāma*, plural, in *sāṁhitā* also, at iv.6.5<sup>5</sup>; 7.13<sup>4</sup>. For *dhārayā, bṛhaspate dhārayā vasiṇī* (i.8.7<sup>1</sup> and vi.3.6<sup>1</sup>): other cases at iv.1.5<sup>4</sup>, 7<sup>2</sup>. For *dharshā*, W. B. have *dharshā mānushān adbhyaḥ* (i.3.8<sup>1</sup>), but G. M., *dharshā mānushān iti ni yunakti* (vi.3.6<sup>3</sup>). For *ghā, uta vā ghā syālāt* (i.1.14<sup>1</sup>): there is another case, if my manuscript reads correctly, at iii.4.11<sup>6</sup>. For *vardhayā, tam agne vardhayā tvam* (iv.6.3<sup>1</sup>): other cases are at i.5.5<sup>2</sup>: iv.2.4<sup>4</sup>; 7.13<sup>5</sup>. For *bodhā, bodhā no asya vacaso yavishīha* (iv.2.3<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words). For *atrā, atrā te rūpam* (iv.6.7<sup>3</sup>): other cases are at iv.6.7<sup>2</sup>, 8<sup>2</sup>. For *tatrā, tatrā ratham upa gāgmaṁ* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>). For *mūñcd, pra mūñcd svastaye* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>): again at iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>. For *āgvasyā, ekas tvash-tur āgvasyā vičastā* (iv.6.9<sup>3</sup>). For *prṇasvā, saptā yonir a prṇasvā ghrtena* (i.5.3<sup>3</sup> and iv.6.5<sup>5</sup>). For *sthā* after *hi*, *apo hi shthā mayobhuvaḥ* (iv.1.5<sup>1</sup>: v.6.1<sup>4</sup>; vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>); and, as counter-example, to show that the correction takes place only after *hi*, *pratishtā vā ekaviñcāḥ* (v.2.3<sup>6</sup> et al.). For *tarā* after *trām*, *agne trām tarā mrdhāḥ* (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup>), with the counter-example *antaratarā taptuvrato bhavati* (vi.2.2<sup>7</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *janishvā, janī-*

8. ———<sup>1</sup> *eteshv anavagraheshv antyasvaro vibhāge vyanjana-paro hrasvam ḍapadyate. yathā: avā-----: sac-----: pra-----: mr-----: var-----: ciksh-----: rak-----: adyā-----: bhāv-----: a go-----: yat-----: pra-----: pibā-----: rip-----: api vikṛtam* (i.51) *apy akarādi* (i.52) *iti dvābhyām<sup>2</sup> vacanā-bhyām prā----- ity atra hrasvādecaḥ kim na syāt: māi 'vam:* *api vikṛtam* (i.51) *iti vacanām kāñṭhoktapadavishayām<sup>3</sup> na tv akārādipadavishayam<sup>4</sup>: prāṇā<sup>5</sup> ity asyā 'py akarāditvān nā*

*shvā hi jenyo agne* (iv.1.3<sup>4</sup> and v.1.4<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *agne*). For *yukshvā*, *yukshvā hi devahūtamān* (ii.6.11<sup>1</sup> et al.): other cases at iv.2.9<sup>5</sup>; v.5.3<sup>1,2</sup>. For *achā*, *achā nakshi dyumattamah* (i.5.6<sup>3</sup> and iv.4.4<sup>8</sup>): other cases at i.7.10<sup>2</sup>; ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>; 6.11<sup>1</sup>; iv.2.4<sup>2</sup> twice; 4.4<sup>2</sup> (if my MS. is correct; the Rik reads *acha*); 5.1<sup>2</sup>; 6.7<sup>5</sup>: but the compound *achāvāka* (vii.1.5<sup>6</sup>) is left undivided and unchanged.

The occasion of the commentator's delay and discussion over the word *nd* is given by the fact that the *pada*-text of the Tāittirīya Sanhitā (unlike that of the Rik and Atharvan: see note to Ath. Pr. iv.39) divides the word *prāṇḍh* thus: *pra-andh*. Hence, when we read in the Sanhitā, as in the passage which he quotes, *prāṇā vā añcavāh* (vi.4.4<sup>4</sup>: W. B. read simply *prāṇā vāi*, which occurs in various other places; e.g. v.3.8<sup>2</sup>), he fears that, having this division in mind, we shall be misled into believing that the specification *nd* of the present rule applies to *prāṇā*, because we are taught in the first chapter (i.51,52) that a word cited in any rule comes equally under that rule when phonetically altered, or preceded by *a*. He sets aside this difficulty, however, by the arbitrary *dictum* that it is not permitted to vary the same word in both ways at once—that we may accept the altered form only of a vocable which is actually quoted entire, not of one made by the prefixion of an *a* to one so quoted: hence, he infers, the present rule does not apply to [the *and* of] *prāṇā*, as it begins with *a*. But a further objection is interposed: in that case, why does it not apply to the part *and* of the compound, in which is no altered *n*? He replies, because of the absence of a long vowel in *samhitā*, in a word wearing this form—or, as would seem a better statement, because of the absence of any such word in *samhitā* as *and* (for *andh*) with a long vowel as its final. The second objection, in fact, is a wholly futile one, scarcely worth the trouble of bringing up and setting aside. The original difficulty is one growing out of the extension of the leading rule in the chapter to cases of final *ā* in *samhitā* where a *visarjaniya* has been lost after it (see note to rule 1). The answer has a somewhat quibbling aspect, but the rule of interpretation which it involves is in accordance with that adopted in one or two analogous cases elsewhere.

## अधार्मियात्ये ॥ ६ ॥

9. Also *adhā*, in *agni* and *yajyā* passages.

'yam vidhiḥ. tarhi vikrtatvābhāvādān ity asye' 'ngyāñçasya'  
*kim na syād ayam vidhiḥ. eva nīrūpasya samhitāyām dirghābhāvāt. dhā---: bṛh---: dhar---: uta---: tam---: bo-*  
*dha---: atrā---: tat---: pra---: ek---: sap---:*  
*āpo---: hī 'ti kim: pra---: agne---: tvam iti kim:*  
*ant---: jan---: yuk---: achā---.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. *ktip-*; B. om. *pada*. <sup>4</sup> B. om. *pada*. <sup>5</sup> W. ins. *vā*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *vākrtasyābh-*. <sup>7</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> B. G. M. *-yāç-*.

The commentator's first care is to define what parts of the Sanhitâ are styled *agni* and *yâjyâ*. The former name, he says, designates those *mantras* which celebrate Agni—namely, the fourth *kânda*: by the latter are intended the concluding *anuvâkas*, or sections, of every *prâgna*, or chapter, from the beginning of the Sanhitâ to the third *prâgna* of the fourth *kânda*, inclusive; and, besides, the eleventh *anuvâka* of *prâgna* six, *kânda* two (i. e. i.1.14; 2.14; 3.14; 4.46; 5.11; 6.12; 7.13; 8.22: ii.1.11; 2.12; 3.14; 4.14; 5.12; 6.11,12: iii.1.11; 2.11; 3.11; 4.11; 5.11: iv.1.11; 2.11; 3.13—in all, twenty-three *anuvâkas*). The name *agni* does not occur again: the *yâjyâs* are the subject of further prescription below, in rules iii.11, ix.20, xi.3. The compound *agniyâjya* (neuter singular) is justified by a simple reference to Pânini's rule (ii.2.29) defining a copulative compound.

The passages cited in illustration of the rule are *adhâ hy agne krutoh* (iv.4.4<sup>7</sup>), *adhâ ca nah carma yacha dvibarhâd* (iv.5.10<sup>8</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), *adhâ te sumnam imâhe* (ii.6.11<sup>4</sup>), and *adhâ yathâ nah pitarah* (ii.6.12<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit the last word): I have noted no other cases. As counter-example, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in the rule, is quoted *adhâ me 'ti tad vishnave 'ti prâyachat* (ii.4.12<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit *prâyachat*), where *adhâ* stands for *adhâh*: see, for the bearing of the exception, the note upon the introductory rule of the chapter.

कुत्रादक्षिणेनास्वेनाकृतनाऽगामारुद्देमाविभूर्धीमाच-  
कृमाद्वामास्तरीमाभरेमावर्षयथेरयथारियापायाथासिच्छथा-  
डनयथाडयतोक्षतावतायाताशृणुताकृणुताबिभृता ॥ १० ॥

10. Also *kutrâ*, *dakshinenâ*, *svenâ*, *hantânâ*, *jagâmâ*, *ruhemâ*, *vidmâ*, *râdhymâ*, *cakrmâ*, *kshâmâ*, *starîmâ*, *bharemâ*, *varshayathâ*, *irayathâ*, *ârithâ*, *pâthâ*, *âthâ*, *siñcathâ*, *jana-yathâ*, *jayatâ*, *ukshatâ*, *avatâ*, *yâtâ*, *grñutâ*, *kriñutâ*, *bibhrtâ*.

The commentator's illustrative passages are: for *kutrâ*, *kutrâ cid yasya samrtâu* (ii.1.11<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *dak-*

9. *agnic-ea yâjyâ cå 'gniyâjyam<sup>1</sup>: tasmin<sup>2</sup>: cå 'rthe dvandva iti<sup>3</sup> samâsah. cagnir ity agniprakâçakamantrâ<sup>4</sup> lakshyante: caturthakânda ity artha<sup>5</sup>: ubhâ vdm in drâgnî (i.1.14<sup>1</sup>) prabhriti agnir vrtrâni (iv.3.13<sup>1</sup>) paryantâ pragnottamânuvâkâ yâjyâsanjnâ bhavanti yukshvâ hi (ii.6.11<sup>1</sup>) ity anuvâkaç ca. 'atra vishaye<sup>6</sup> 'dhe ty asmin<sup>7</sup> grahañe 'nyasvaro vibhâgê' vyanjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate. yathâ: adhâ hy----: adhâ ca----: adhâ te----: adhâ y----: agniyâjya iti kim: adhâ m----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *jye.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-ih.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> B. *-faman.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *etasmin.* <sup>7</sup> G. M. om.

*shinend, dakshīnenā vasūni patīḥ sindhānām asi* (iii.4.11<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit after *vasūni*). For *svend*, *svend hi vṛtrañ ṣavasā jaghantha* (vii.4.15: B. omits the last word; G. M. the last two). For *hantānā, tapasā hantānā tam* (iv.3.13<sup>4</sup>). For *jagāmd, a jagāmd para-syāḥ* (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>). For *ruhemā, asravantim a ruhemā svastaye* (i.5.11<sup>5</sup>). For *vidmā, vidmā te agne tredhā trayāni vidmā te* (iv.2.2<sup>1</sup>: G. M. stop at *agne*, thus instancing only one of the two cases; there are two more in the same verse): also at i.7.13<sup>3</sup>: ii.6.11<sup>4</sup>. For *ṛdhyānd, ṛdhyānd ta ohāih* (iv.4.4<sup>7</sup>). For *cakrmā, cakrmā kac caṇā "gah* (iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>): other cases at i.8.3: ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>: iv.1.11<sup>1</sup>; 6.8<sup>3</sup>. For *kshānd, kshānd rerihad vīrudhāḥ* (i.3.14<sup>2</sup>: iv.2.1<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): other cases at ii.6.12<sup>4</sup>: iv.7.12<sup>3</sup>. For *starimā, sushtārimā jushānd* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>): here the application of rule i.51 becomes necessary. For *bharemā, añhō-muce pra bharemā manishām* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *varshayathā, yāyam vṛṣhtiñ varshayathā puriśināḥ* (ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit the first word). For *irayathā, ud irayathā marutāh* (ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>). For *ārithā, yoner udārithā yaje tam* (iv.6.5<sup>4</sup>). For *pāthā, kshaye pāthā divo vimahasāḥ* (iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>). For *athā, athā somasya prayatī yuvabhyām* (i.1.14<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): other cases are numerous, namely i.1.13<sup>1</sup> twice; 5.5<sup>2</sup>, 11<sup>3</sup>; 6.4<sup>2</sup> twice; 7.13<sup>4</sup>; ii.8.14<sup>3</sup>; 6.12<sup>2</sup>; iii.1.11<sup>2</sup>; 4.11<sup>6</sup>; iv.2.1<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>4</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>, 6.1.<sup>2</sup>; 6.3<sup>4</sup> twice; 7.18<sup>5</sup>; and, as I doubt not, at the end of iii.2.11<sup>2</sup>, where, however, the present *sāṁhitā*-text reads *athā*, because the word stands *vibhāge*. For *siñcatā, yatrā naro marutāh siñca-thā madhu* (iii.1.11<sup>8</sup>). For *janayathā, apo janayathā ca nah* (iv.1.5<sup>1</sup>: v.6.1<sup>4</sup>: vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>). For *jayatā, upa pre 'ta jayatā nara sthīrāḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *ukshatā, a ghṛtam ukshatā madhuvarṇam* (iv.3.13<sup>8</sup>). For *avatā, asmān u devā avatā haveshu* (iv.6.4<sup>4</sup>): another case at iv.2.6<sup>3</sup>. For *yātā, devā rathār yātā hiranyayādīḥ* (iv.7.12<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first word). For *śrṇutā, marutā śrṇutā havam* (iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>). For *kṛṇu-tā, sāṁvatsarāya kṛṇutā bṛhan namah* (v.7.2<sup>4</sup>). Finally, for *bibhṛtā, māte 'va putram bibhṛtā sv enam* (iv.2.3<sup>2</sup>: W. B. begin at *putram*).

## भरता याज्यासु ॥ ११ ॥

11. Also *bharatā*, in *yājyā* passages.

10. .... *ity<sup>1</sup> eteshv anavagraheshv<sup>2</sup> antyasvaro vibhāge vyāñjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: kutrā....: da-ksh....: svend....: tap....: a j....: asr....: vidmā....: ṛdhy....: cakr....: kshā....: susht....: añh....: yā-yam....: ud....: yoner....: kshaye....: athā....: ya-trā....: apo....: upa....: a....: asmān....: devā....: mar....: sam....: mā....:*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. *avag-*; G. M. om.

Which are the sections called *yājyā* has been pointed out above, under rule 9.

The cited passages are: *bharatā vasuvittamam* (iii.5.11<sup>4</sup>), *bharatā jätivedasam* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>), and *pūryaṁ vaco 'gnaye bharatā bṛhat* (iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first two words), which are all that the text contains. As counter-example, to show the necessity of restricting the change to *yājyā* passages, is quoted *esha vo bharatā rājā* (i.8.10<sup>2</sup>, 12<sup>2</sup>), where *bharatā* stands for *bharatāḥ*. If the text contained a *bharatā* as instrumental of the participle *bharant*, it would come more properly under the action of the rule, and would have a better right to be specifically excluded; but I have not found such a form anywhere. Respecting *bharatā* as standing in *samhitā* for *bharatāḥ*, see what is said in the note to the first rule of this chapter.

अत्ताभवतानद्यातरतातपताङुक्तावोचतामुच्चताचृ-  
ताधुष्याजनयावर्तयासाद्यापारयादीयाक्षरभरापाससाद-  
सृजातिष्ठयेना ॥ १२ ॥

12. Also *attā*, *bhavatā*, *anadatā*, *taratā*, *tapatā*, *juhutā*, *vocatā*, *amuñcatā*, *crtā*, *ghushyā*, *janayā*, *vartayā*, *sādayā*, *pā-rayā*, *diyā*, *harā*, *bharā*, *apā*, *sasādā*, *srjā*, *tishīhā*, and *yendā*.

The cited passages are: for *attā*, *attā havīñshi* (ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>). For *bhavatā*, *adityāśo bhavatā mr̄dayantah* (i.4.22 and ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>). For *anudatā*, *sampruyatir ahāv anadatā hāte* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit the first word). For *taratā*, *suvo ruhāñś taratā rajāñsi* (iii.5.4<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word). For *tapatā*, *gharmān na sāmān tapatā suvrktibhih* (i.6.12<sup>2</sup>: W. B. O. [O. begins in the comment to this rule] omit before *tapatā*). For *juhutā*, *pitre juhutā viçvakarmane* (iv.6.2<sup>6</sup>). For *vocatā*, *viçve devāśo adhi vocatā me* (iv.7.14<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit to *adhi*). For *amuñcatā*, *padi shidm amuñcatā yajatrāh* (iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>). For *crtā*, *ayasmayām vi crtū bandham etum* (iv.2.5<sup>3</sup>). For *ghushyā*, *parushparur anu ghushyā viçasta* (iv.6.9<sup>3</sup>). For *janayā*, *manur bhava janayā dāiviyam janam* (iii.4.2<sup>2</sup>, 3<sup>7</sup>). For *vartayā*, *tābhīrā vartayā punah* (iii.3.10<sup>1</sup>). For *sādayā*, *sādayā yujñāni sukrtasya yonāu* (iii.5.11<sup>2</sup> and iv.1.3<sup>3</sup>). For *pā-rayā*, *agne tvam pā-rayā naryo asmān* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>: all but W. omit the last word). For *diyā*, *bṛhaspate pari diyā rathena* (iv.6.4<sup>1-2</sup>: the text reads *diya*, as the word stands before the division between the first and second fifty of the section): another case is iii.1.11<sup>6</sup>. For *harā*, *nīhāram in ni me harā nīhāram*

---

11. *bharatā ity asmin<sup>1</sup> grahanē<sup>2</sup> 'nyasvaro yājyāvishaye<sup>3</sup> vibhāge vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: bhar-----: bhar-----: pūr----- yājydsu iti kīm: esha-----:*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasmin*. <sup>2</sup> B. *avagraheshv*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *yājyāyām*, and put before the preceding word.

(i.8.4<sup>1</sup>). For *bhardā*, *mā no*, *mardhīr ā bhardā dadhi tan naḥ pra ddūcuse* (i.7.13<sup>2</sup>: O. omits after *bhardā*; B. G. M. after *dadhi*): there is no other case, *bhurā* at i.3.14<sup>3</sup> in the Calcutta edition being an erratum. For *apā*, *duro na vṛdjāñ grutyā apā vrdhi* (ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit the first two words). For *sasādā*, *agnir hotā ni sha-sādā yajyān* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup> and iv.1.3<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the first word): there is another case at iv.6.2<sup>1</sup>, requiring, like the others, the application of rule i.51. For *srjā*, *srjā vṛṣṭimī divah* (ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>, 10<sup>2</sup>): there are other cases at ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>: iii.5.5<sup>2</sup>, 10<sup>1</sup>: iv.1.8<sup>3</sup>. For *tishṭhā*, *tishṭhā devo na savitā* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>): other cases at iii.1.4<sup>1</sup>: v.2.1<sup>4</sup>, and perhaps also at iv.1.2<sup>3</sup>, where the word ends a division of the *anuvāka*. For *yend*, *yend sahasram vahasi* (iv.7.13<sup>4</sup> and v.7.7<sup>3</sup>).

## ॐसीक्रियीकृधीश्रुधीयदी ॥ १३ ॥

### 13. Also *uṣmasī*, *krayī*, *kṛdhī*, *grudhī*, and *yadī*.

The quoted examples for these words, being the only ones which the text contains, are as follows. For *uṣmasī*, *te te dhāmāny uṣmasī gamadhye* (i.3.6<sup>1-2</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first three words): here, as *uṣmasī* stands at the end of a division, or *vibhāg*, its *i* is short in the accepted text. For *krayī*, *rudra yat te krayī param nāma* (i.8.14<sup>2</sup>). For *kṛdhī*, *kṛdhī sv asmān aditeḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>: W. B. O. omit the last word). For *grudhī*, *imam me varuṇa grudhī havam* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>). For *yudī*, *yadī bhūmīm janayan* (iv.6.2<sup>4</sup>).

## सूत्नमिथ्यमनूज ॥ १४ ॥

### 14. Also *sū*, *tū*, *nū*, *mithū*, *makshū*, and *ū*.

The cited passages are as follows: for *sū*, *mo shū nā indra* (i.8.3). For *tū*, *ā tū na upa gantana* (i.5.11<sup>4-5</sup>): there are two other cases, i.7.13<sup>3</sup>: ii.2.12<sup>7</sup>, both after *ā*. For *nū*, *etācasya nū rane* (iv.6.1<sup>2</sup>). For *mithū*, *gātrāny asinā mithū kāḥ* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the first word). For *makshū*, *makshū devavato rathah* (i.8.22<sup>3</sup>). For *ū*, a part of the manuscripts give two examples,

12. .... eteshv anavagraheshv<sup>1</sup> antyasvaro<sup>2</sup> vibhāgे vyanjanaparo hrasvam ḍapadyate. yathā: attā....: ad....: sampr....: suvo....: ghar....: pitre....: viṣve....: padi....: ayas....: par....: man....: tābh....: sād....: agne....: brh....: nih....: mā....: duro....: agnir....: srjā....: tish....: yend....

<sup>1</sup> W. av.; G. M. grahaṇeshu. <sup>2</sup> O. begins here.

13. .... ity<sup>1</sup> eteshv<sup>2</sup> anavagraheshv<sup>3</sup> antyasvaro vibhāgे vyanjanaparo hrasvam ḍapadyate. yathā: te....: rudra....: kṛdhī....: imam....: yadī....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. eshv. <sup>3</sup> W. av.; G. M. om.

*asmābhīr ā nu praticakṣyā 'bhūt* (i.4.33: wanting in G. M.), and *ārdhva ā shu na utaye* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first word, G. M. the last): other cases are found at i.5.11<sup>5</sup>; ii.5.12<sup>2</sup>; iii.5.10<sup>1</sup>; iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>; 6.5<sup>6</sup>; v.1.5<sup>3</sup>; vii.1.18<sup>2</sup>; 6.17<sup>2</sup>.

## व्युत्पूर्व आननुदात्तो ज्ञानमवत्यनूभवति ॥ १५ ॥

15. Also *ān*, when unaccented, and preceded by *vi* or *ut*, in a word containing no spirant.

This rule applies simply to the compounds *vyāna* and *uddāna*, in which the long *a* of the radical syllable is treated by the *pada*-text as the effect of an irregular prolongation. The words are instanced by the commentator in their full *pada*-form, *vyāndye 'ti vi-andya* (iii.5.8 et al.), and *udāndye 'ty ut-andya* (iv.2.9<sup>1</sup> et al.). In the same manner, *prāndya* and *apāndya* are divided into *pra-andya* and *apa-andya*. As regards the treatment of this group of compounds, the different *pada*-texts are somewhat inconsistent and somewhat conflicting. The Atharvan *pada* (see Ath. Pr. iv.39) divides *vi-āna* and *sam-āna*, without correption of the radical *a*, but leaves *prāna* and *apāna* undivided. The Rik *pada* does not divide *prāna*: I do not know that any of the others are Rik words. The White Yajus, again (Vāj. Pr. v.33,36), divides *apa-āna* and *sam-āna*, but not *prāna*. The consistency of the Taittiriya *śākhanāh* is to be commended; less, perhaps, their assumption that the *a* of *āna* is a mere Vedic irregularity, requiring restoration to a correcter form. They also, it may be remarked, divide *prāṇatha* (iv.1.4<sup>1</sup>) into *pra-matha*.

The commentator goes on to cite counter-examples, proving the necessity of the restrictions imposed by the rule. To show that *ān* is to be shortened only after *vi* and *ut*, he gives *yad ānṛcūs tene 'yam* (vii.3.1<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. omit the last word), and *paryānīyā havanyasya* (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>). To show that only *ān*, not *a* followed by any other consonant, is shortened, he quotes *yad rukmīn vyāghā-rayati* (v.2.7<sup>5</sup>), and *udādāya pṛthivīm jiradānuḥ* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). To show that the *ān* must not be accented, he gives *vicvākarmā vyā'nat* (iv.2.10<sup>4</sup>), and *nēshṭah pātmām udā-naya* (vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>). Finally, to show that the presence of a spirant in the word prevents the correption, we have *pathā mudhor dhārd vyāṇaugh* (v.7.7<sup>3</sup>: all but W. omit the first word), and *ud āniśhur mahīr iti* (v.6.1<sup>3</sup>).

The question is now in point, how complete is this rehearsal of the cases of prolonged vowels occurring in the Sanhītā; or, how closely does the *pada*-text which it assumes correspond with that

14. .... *ity<sup>1</sup> eteshv<sup>2</sup> anavugruheshv<sup>3</sup> antyasvaro vibhāge*  
*vyāñjanaparo hrasram āpadyate. yathā: mo----: ā----:*  
*eta----: gā----: mak----: asm----: ārdhva----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. eshv. <sup>3</sup> W. av.; G. M. om.

found in the existing *pada*-manuscripts? As regards the latter point, I am unable to speak with certainty, of course, without the possession of a *pada*-manuscript, and its careful examination throughout; but so much as this I can say—that, having referred a liberal selection of the most questionable cases to Dr. Haug at Munich, for verification in his *pada*-texts, no instance of a discordance between these and the Prātiçākhya has come to light. Among the cases referred were several in regard to which I was beforehand very confident that I had caught the authors of the Prātiçākhya in fault. Thus *yojā*, in the refrain *yojā nv indra te hari* (i.8.5<sup>1,2</sup>) which is shortened to *yoja* in the *pada*-texts both of the Rik (by Rik Pr. vii.7) and the White Yajus (by Vāj. Pr. iii.106), remains *yojā* in that of our Sanhitā. Again, *eva* occurs six times in our text with its final lengthened (viz. at i.8.22<sup>2</sup>: ii.1.11<sup>3</sup>: iv.2.9<sup>2</sup>; 3.13<sup>3</sup>; 7.15<sup>7</sup>: v.2.8<sup>3</sup>), as it does also not infrequently in the other Vedic texts (as noticed and provided for in their Prātiçākhyas: see Rik Pr. vii.12,19; viii.20: Vāj. Pr. iii.123: Ath. Pr. iii.16, note, I.1.c.): but the Tāittirya *pada* reads in each case *evā*. Once more, in the passage *tava dhurnā yuyopima* (Rig-Veda vii.89.5; Ath. Veda vi.51.3; Tāitt. Sanh. iii.4 11<sup>6</sup>), the *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan read *dharma* (I do not find that the case is noted in the Rik Pr.; in the Ath. Pr. it would fall under the comprehensive rule iii.16), while that of our Sanhitā has *dharma*, like the *samhitā*-reading.

I will add, as received from the same quarter, a few words respecting which a question might naturally arise as to how they were treated in the *pada*-text. Separated, without correction of the long vowel at the end of their first member, are *uttard-vat* (v.4.8<sup>6</sup>), *sahasr-van* (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>), *malmūla-bhavant* (i.4.34), *vṛṣhā-kapi* (i.7.13<sup>2</sup>), such copulative compounds as *indrā-varunayoh* (ii.5.12<sup>2</sup>) and *agnā-vishnu* (i.1.12), and *urṇād-mradas* (i.1.11<sup>1</sup>: while, nevertheless, we have *urṇā-mradas* at i.2.2<sup>2</sup>, the *pada*-reading agreeing in both cases with that of the *samhitā*: where the Calcutta edition gets its authority for reading *urṇām̄mradas* and *urṇām̄mradas* is more than I can imagine).

15. vi 'ty evampūrva upārvo vā "n ity esha<sup>1</sup> svaro 'nuddatto  
 'ndshmaravat<sup>2</sup> ushmarahite pade vartamāno vyanjanaparah padā-  
 dāu vartamānatvāt pūrvapadena<sup>3</sup> vibhāge sati hrasvam āpadyate.  
 yathā: vyāñdye 'ti vi-andya: udāñdye 'ty ut-andya.  
 evampūrva iti kim: yad----: pary----: nakārah kimarthā:  
 yad----: udā----: anuddatta iti kim: viçv----: nesh----:  
 anashmarati 'ti kim: pathā----: ud----

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhya vivarane  
 tr̄tyo 'dhyāyuh<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. akdra. <sup>2</sup> W. ushm-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -de. <sup>4</sup> G. M. add. grikṛshṇāya namah.

Not separated, and therefore, of course, without correction of the vowel, are such words as *r̥tāshd̄t* (iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>) and *turāshd̄t* (i.7.13<sup>4</sup>), also *tvash̄tīmant* (i.2.5<sup>2</sup>), *anyādṝc* (i.8.13<sup>2</sup>), *ubhayādut* (ii.2.6<sup>3</sup>), *arātīyat* (i.6.1<sup>1</sup>) and *arātīvan* (vii.4.15), *atikd̄ca* (i.2.2<sup>2</sup>) and *prākāca* (i.8.18), *avāgr̄ngā* (ii.1.8<sup>5</sup>) and *prāgr̄ngā* (ii.1.8<sup>1</sup>: I doubt not: my information is deficient for this word), *upānah* (v.4.4<sup>4</sup>), *nīvāra* (iv.7.4<sup>2</sup>) and *nīhāra* (iv.8.2<sup>3</sup>), and *purūravāh* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup>).

There is not, as in the other Vedic texts, any restoration of a theoretically correct short vowel which is not strictly a final or initial: thus we read in *pada*-text, for example, *vāvṝdhe* (i.4.20), *sāsa-hat* (i.3.14<sup>7</sup>), and *ushāsam* (iv.4.4<sup>2</sup>).

Many of these items constitute striking peculiarities of the Taittiriya *pada*, and its careful study and comparison with the other works of its class would undoubtedly bring to light much that is curious.

## CHAPTER IV.

CONTENTS: 1-4, introductory; 5-54, rehearsal of cases of *pragrahas*, or uncombinable final vowels.

### अथ प्रग्रहः ॥१॥

#### 1. Now the *pragrahas*.

A simple heading to the chapter, and explained as such by the commentator. The same subject is treated by the other Pratiçākhyas, at Rik Pr. i.18-19, Vāj. Pr. i.92-98, Ath. Pr. i.73-82. It occupies here a great deal more space, because the Taitt. Pr. avoids on principle the mention of grammatical categories in its rules, and is at infinite pains to catalogue, word by word, what the other treatises dispose of summarily, by classes. A rule in a later chapter (x.24) teaches that all the vowels here rehearsed and defined as *pragraha* are exempt from euphonic combination. The term *pragraha* is peculiar to this treatise, the rest using instead *pragr̄hya*.

### नावग्रहः ॥२॥

#### 2. No former member of a compound is *pragraha*.

As the former member of a separable compound (*avagraha*: i.49) is regarded and treated as an independent *pada*, the rules declaring certain final vowels *pragraha* would apply to the finals

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikd̄rah: pragrahā ucyanta ity 'etad<sup>2</sup> adhikṛtam veditavyam ita<sup>1</sup> uttarām yad vakshyāmaḥ.*

<sup>(1)</sup> W. om.   <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. om.

of such members, but for this prescription to the contrary. The commentator cites rules 5, 6, 36, 37, 49 of the chapter as needing the restriction of their application here made, and quotes from the Sanhitā in illustration *taninapād asurah* (iv.1.8<sup>1</sup>: the *tanā* of *tanā-napāt* would otherwise be *pragraha* by rule 5), *agoargham yajamānam* (vi.1.10<sup>1</sup>: *ago-argham* would fall else under rule 6), *agnīshomdu mā* (ii.5.2<sup>2</sup>: it is implied that the *pada*-text would write *agnī-somdu*, bringing the word within the sphere of rule 36; such compounds are not divisible in the other Vedic texts), and *dvedve puronuvākye kuryāt* (ii.2.9<sup>2</sup>: the *pada* writes *dve-dve*, so that both members would be declared alike *pragraha* by rule 49). The present precept is therefore declared to be one making exceptions in advance to the rules specified.

### अतः ॥३॥

#### 3. Only a final is *pragraha*.

Or, as the commentator paraphrases, the end of a word is entitled to the designation *pragraha*. He cites, as example, the phrase *devate samṛddhyāi* (ii.1.9<sup>3</sup>). The necessity of the rule, he explains, arises out of the fact that the following rules, in part—for example, rules 5, 6, 33—describe certain letters or syllables as *pragraha* without farther limitation, and it is desirable to specify that they bear that character only when final. This in answer to the criticizing inquiry “whether a letter not final can also be *pragraha*?”—that is, as I understand it, whether this predicate is not in the nature of things restricted to finals? But now a yet more troublesome objection is raised. The limitation to finals, urges the interpellator, is otherwise assured; for the word *api* of the next rule, in the sequel of this one, brings into action the principle “continued implication is of that which is last” (i.58). The objection is wholly futile and inept, both as implying that false interpretation of the rule appealed to to which attention was directed in the note upon it, and as attributing to *api* a mysterious force to which it can lay no claim whatever. Instead, however, of showing the

---

2. *avagrahah pragraho na bhavati: ukārah* (iv.5): *okāro 'śāñhito 'kāravyañjanaparah* (iv.6): *gnī* (iv.36): *na hi parah* (iv.37): *dve* (iv.49) *iti vakshyate*: *etad' uddīcyā purastādapavādo 'nena vidhīyate. yathā: tan-----: ago-----: agn-----: dve-----: avagraha' iti jātyapekshāyām ekavacanam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -ti; B. O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *tad*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *nā'u-*.

3. *padasyā 'ntah pragrahasamyño bhavati. yathā: dev----- atrā "ha: kim apadānto 'pi pragrahah syāt. atro 'cyate: ukārah* (iv.5) *ity avīcēshena vakshyati: okāro 'śāñhito 'kāravyañjanaparah* (iv.6) *iti: cīyatpraparah* (iv.33) *iti ca: apadāntasyo 'kārasyāu 'kārasya cīcabdasya vā pragrahatvam' mā bhūd iti.*

objector to the door; the commentator proceeds elaborately to confute him. "We reply, not so: specification of finality is appropriate where there is a congeries of several letters; here, on the other hand, there is indication of a single letter. If the matter in question were the euphonic alteration or elision of *ū* and the other letters treated of, a final would be designated in virtue of the principle quoted: but here it is a simple case of application of the term *pragraha*, not of an affected nor an affecting letter: hence continued implication has no force."

### इतिपरो जपि ॥८॥

#### 4. It is followed by *iti*.

This is the interpretation of the commentator, who declares that the "also" (*api*) brings in by implication, from the first rule of the preceding chapter, the specification *vibhāge*, 'in case of separation,' or in the *pada* and other artificially divided texts. As example, he cites *ubhe iti* (i.4.22 et al.: G. M. add *devate iti*, ii.1.9<sup>a</sup> et al.).

If such be its real meaning, the rule is a very anomalous one, as giving a single direct prescription respecting the mode of construction of the secondary texts. These are elsewhere only referred to or implied, in a more indirect manner. I should therefore prefer to translate 'even when followed by *iti*'—that is to say, a word here defined as *pragraha* in the ordinary text has that character also in the other texts before *iti*, not being combined with the latter.

### अकारः ॥५॥

#### 5. A long *ū* is *pragraha*.

---

*nanu siddham evdi 'tat: etatsūtraçeshabhdā<sup>2</sup> uttarasūtre<sup>3</sup> 'pi-  
bdendā 'nvādego 'ntyasya* (i.58) *eva kāryanirvāhdt*. ne 'ti  
brāmah: anekavarṇasamudāye hy antyatvam<sup>4</sup> upapannam:  
ayam punar ekavarṇanirdecah: ukārah (iv.5) *ity ādivarṇasya  
yāni vikāralopāu taylor<sup>5</sup> anvādego 'ntyasya* (i.58) *ity anendā  
'ntyah: pragraha ity uktam<sup>6</sup> pragrahasamjñāmātram<sup>7</sup>: na tu  
nimittam nimitti vā: tasmodd anvādego na prasarati.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *grahanam*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. -*seshe*; G. M. -*bhūt*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *ottarasasya sū-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*vāhakah*. <sup>5</sup> B. O. *anta*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *ins. eva*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. '*ntyapratyaya uktah*'. <sup>8</sup> G. M. -*ha iti sami*-. <sup>9</sup> B. O. *om*.

4. *apiçabdah sinhāvalokanenā 'thā "dāv uttare vibhāge* (iii.1) *ity atra vibhāgapadam<sup>1</sup> anvādicati: so 'yam pragraho  
vibhāga itiparo bhavati. yathā: <sup>2</sup> ubhe iti. itiçabdah paro  
yasmād asdv itiparah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*gam*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ins. devate iti*.

The commentator adds the limitation "if long in *pada*-text," the final *a* is universally *pragraha*; referring, in justification, to the cases treated of above, in rule iii.14, of an *u* irregularly lengthened in *samhitā*. His examples are *hanū vā ete yajñasya* (vi.2.11<sup>2</sup>: W. B. O. omit the last word), *vāsantikāv rta* *cukraç ca* (iv.4.11<sup>1</sup>: W. B. O. omit after *rta*), and *harinasya bāhā upastutam janima tat te arvan* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last four words; the others, the first word).

## ओकारो ज्ञाश्विता ज्ञारव्यज्ञनपरः ॥ ६ ॥

6. Also an *o* which is not the product of euphonic combination, if followed by *a* or a consonant.

Of words exhibiting in *pada*-text, as well as in *samhitā*, a final *o*, there are (apart from the theme *go*, which occurs only as first member of a compound, and therefore, by rule 2 of this chapter, does not require to be regarded in the determination of *pragrahas*) two classes, the one composed of vocatives from themes in *u*, the other of words whose final *a* or *ā* is combined with the particle *u*. The present rule deals, in general, with the former class; the one next following, with the latter class. The right of the vocatives in *o* to be treated as *pragrahas* is a very dubious one, and is not unequivocally supported by the *Prātiçākhya*; for to say that such words are *pragraha* before *a* or a consonant is not to distinguish them perceptibly from the euphonic *o* which comes from a final *as*; since this also is not capable of combination with a consonant, and does not necessarily absorb a following initial *a*. The only instances in which a vocative in *o* exhibits a *pragraha* character are the three which are cited under the next rule (i.4.27: v.7.2<sup>4</sup>: vi.5.8<sup>3</sup>); the cases in which it is regularly changed to *av* before other vowels than *a* are much more numerous: namely, before *ā*, at i.4.39: ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>; 6.11<sup>1</sup>: vi.4.3<sup>3</sup>; before *i*, at ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>; before *u*, at i.2.13<sup>2</sup> twice; 6.12<sup>3</sup>: iii.2.10<sup>1</sup>; before *e*, at ii.4.12<sup>3</sup>. I have noted but two cases in the text where such an *o* stands before initial *a* without absorbing it; they are found at i.3.8<sup>1</sup>, 14<sup>7</sup>. And there are the same

---

5. *akārah padāntah sarvatra pragraho bhavati: padasamaye vartamānah. yathā: hanū....: vās....: har.... padasamaye vartamāna iti kim: sūtānāmīthūmakshāu*<sup>1</sup> (iii.14) ity adi.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. omit after *mithū*.

6. *asāṁhita okāro 'kāraparo vā<sup>2</sup> vyañjanaparo vā pragrahah syāt. yathā: vad....: vish.... asāṁhita iti kim: so....: 'pra.... evampara iti kim<sup>3</sup>: vish.... samhitānimittah sāṁhitaḥ: na sāṁhito 'sāṁhitaḥ: akāraç ca vyāñjanam ca 'kāravyāñjane: te pare yasmāt sa tatho 'ktah.*

<sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. B. O. om.

number of cases—namely, at ii.5.12<sup>5</sup> and vi.4.3<sup>4</sup>—in which it causes the elision of a following *a*.

The commentator's citations in illustration of the rule are *vad-mā hi sūno asi* (i.3.14<sup>7</sup>), and *vishno havyañ rakshasva* (i.1.8). To show the necessity of the limitation *asāṁhitāḥ*, he cites *so* 'bravīt' (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), and *pra so agne* (iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>: omitted, however, by W. B. O.), where *so* is the *sāṁhitā* reading for *sāḥ*; and, to show that the prescribed quality belongs to the vowel only before *a* or a consonant (the lacuna of W. B. O. extends through this explanation), he gives us *vishnav e 'hī 'dam* (ii.4.12<sup>3</sup>).

For the teachings of the other Pratiçākhyas respecting this class of asserted *pragrasas*, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.81.

## समहृदयपित्पूर्वश्च ॥७॥

7. As also, when preceded by *s*, *m*, *h*, *d*, *th*, and *pit*.

The *anuvṛtti* of this rule is even more blind and equivocal than usual. Instead of bringing down either the subject or predicate of the one preceding, we are to bring down both, only with the exclusion of one of the modifications included in the former. The meaning is, that an original *o*, preceded as here specified, is *pragraha* even when followed by other vowels than *a*. The commentator is in error in saying that *ca* implies *okāraḥ* from above; he should have said *okaro 'sāṁhitāḥ*.

As above remarked, this rule chiefly concerns the class of *pragrasas* composed of words whose final vowel, *a* or *ā*, is combined with the particle *u*. Of these, *atho* is vastly the most numerous, occurring about two hundred and fifty times in the *Sāṁhitā*. Before *a* it is met with twenty times, always without occasioning elision; before other vowels, twenty-nine times, always uncombined. Along with it, *tatho* is had in view by the rule, as presenting a final *o* after *th*: it is found but once, in the passage cited by the commentator (see below). The only word showing *o* after *s* is *so*, found only in two passages, as noted below. After *m*, we have *o* both in *mo* (in two passages, once before *sh*, at i.8.3; the other is cited by the commentator) and in *imo*, which latter is found only before *a* (iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>), and so does not necessarily come within the purview of the rule. The other words of the class occur before consonants alone, and are, therefore, here made no account of: they are *o* (once, i.4.83), to

7. *pūrvoktapananimittābhāve 'pi kāryavidhānārtham okāram  
viciṇashti: cakāra okāram anvādiçati. sa: ma: ha: da: tha:  
pit: evampūrvo 'sāṁhita okāro 'kāravyañjanābhyañ anyaparo  
'pi pragraho bhavati. yathā: so----: mā----: upa----: indo----:  
tatho----: sa---- evampūrva iti kim: 'gat----:  
asāṁhita iti kim': pra----*

<sup>(1)</sup> B. om.

(i.2.5<sup>2</sup> and vi.1.8<sup>5</sup>) and *uto* (five times), *upo* (four times), and *pro* (i.7.13<sup>5</sup>).

Of the remaining specifications of the rule, the *h* is made for but a single case of the exclamation *ho*, which the commentator quotes: *upahātāññi ho ity dha* (ii.6.7<sup>3</sup>); the *d* is for the vocative *indo*, which occurs twice: *indo indriyāvatuh* (i.4.27), and *indo ity dha* (vi.5.8<sup>3</sup>): the commentator quotes the latter passage; the *pit* is for the vocative *pito*, only found once, as cited: *sa no mayobhāh pito ā viśasva* (v.7.24<sup>4-5</sup>; W. B. O. omit the first three words). These three, as was noted under the preceding rule, are the only instances which the Sanhitā affords of vocatives in *o* showing an uncombinable quality.

The commentator's explanation of the rule is "the *o* is here specially distinguished in order to the prescription of its quality even in the case of absence of the sequent determining circumstances before stated." As examples of words whose ending is combined with *u*, after the consonants specified, he gives *so evāi 'shāi 'tusya* (ii.2.9<sup>7</sup>; 5.5<sup>5</sup>), *mā bher mārō mo eshām* (iv.5.10<sup>1</sup>), and *tatho evo 'ttare nir vapet* (iii.4.9<sup>7</sup>: W. B. O. omit after *uttare*). His counter-examples are *catakrutav ud vañcam ivā* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *ivā*), and *pra so agne* (iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>): but G. M., which have given the latter passage under the preceding rule, here substitute for it *mā so uṣmāñ avahāya* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>); their separate application is manifest.

The treatment by the Prātiçākhyā of words ending in *o* is awkward and bungling to a degree quite rare or wholly unknown elsewhere in its rules. We should be justified in inferring from its statements that *o*, *to*, *uto*, *upo*, and *pro* were not regarded as *pragrahās* at all, nor the vocatives in *o* except under the conditions and in the places specified, and that (if the commentator's explanation of rule 4 is accepted) they are not written with *iti* in the *pada*-text: while, doubtless, in every *pada*-text of the Black Yajus, as in those of the other Vedas, each word is treated uniformly, whether it happen to exhibit its uncombinable quality in *samhiṭi* or not. Through the rest of the chapter, it will be noticed, the words mentioned are defined as *pragrahās*, without regard to the circumstances in which they may stand in the text.

## अयैकारेकारी ॥ ८ ॥

8. Now follow cases of *e* and *ī*.

This is a heading for the remainder of the chapter, excluding all other vowels than final *e* and *ī* from the action of its rules. The words exhibiting such finals are, of course, mainly duals, and are by the other treatises simply defined as such, with immense saving of trouble.

8. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: ekārekardu<sup>1</sup> pragrahatrena vidhī-  
yetē<sup>2</sup> ity etud<sup>3</sup> adhikṛtaiḥ veditavyam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ekāra ikārah*. <sup>2</sup> W. O. -*yate*; B. -*yayate*; G. M. *viçishyata*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

अस्मे ॥६॥

9. *Asme* is *pragraha*.

The example cited by the commentator is, according to W. B. O., *asme te bandhuḥ* (i.2.7); according to G. M., *sampatte gor asme candrāṇī* (also i.2.7). Neither exhibits in *sāṃhitā* the *pragraha* quality of the word, as is done at i.7.13<sup>5</sup> and elsewhere: *asme* is not uncommon in the Sanhitā, occurring twenty-nine times.

ते इत्यनिंग्यातः ॥१०॥

10. Also *tve*, when not the final member of a separable compound.

The office of the word *iti* in this rule is differently explained by the two versions of the commentary: W. B. O. say that it indicates the quality of a separable cited word (they mean, doubtless, of an inseparable); G. M., that it indicates *pragraha* quality. Each interpretation is as good, and as worthless, as the other. The commentary is not infrequently at much pains to put some special, even wonderful, significance into *iti* when found in a rule; and generally with as little acceptable result as here.

The pronoun *tve* occurs seven times in the Sanhitā (at i.3.14<sup>2</sup>; 4.46<sup>1</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>7</sup>; 5.10<sup>1</sup>: iv.2.7<sup>3</sup>; 6.5<sup>4</sup>: vi.1.8<sup>5</sup>), exhibiting its *pragraha*-quality in *sāṃhitā* only once (at iv.2.7<sup>3</sup>). The commentator's instance is *tve kratum api* (iii.5.10<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *api*); and his counter-instance, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in' the rule, is *anāgāstve aditive turdsah* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: G. M. omit *turdsah*), where the *pada*-text reads *anāgāh-tve : aditi-tve*.

देवतेऽमेभागधेऽर्थविशाखेषृङ्गे एन्नेभेतृष्णेतृष्णेकनी-  
निकेयाश्चिवेचोत्तमेऽवोत्तरेशिप्रेरथंतरेवत्सरस्यद्वपेवि-  
द्वपेविषुक्त्वपेसदोहुविर्धनिअधिषवणोअहोरत्रेधृतव्रतेस्तुत-

9. *asme ity asmin<sup>1</sup> grahanे 'nnyasvarah pragraho bhavati. yathā: asme.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasmin*.

10. *itiçabda īngyagrahanatvam<sup>1</sup> dyotayati: anīngyāntas tve  
ity esha çabdah pragraho bhavati. yathā: tve..... anīngyānta.  
iti kim: anā----- īngyasya 'nīta īngyāntah: ne 'nīgyānto  
'nīngyāntah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *pragrahatvam*. T. W. B. O. write *īngy-* throughout.

शस्त्रेन्द्रकसामेश्वरोपर्विते पूर्वत्प्रत्येकविधृतेश्वरनृतेश्वरहिन्दि-  
बद्धलेपूर्वजेकृणाध्वंसदने ॥ ११ ॥

11. Also *devate*, *ubhe*, *bhāgadhe*, *ūrdhve*, *viçākhe*, *çr̥nige*, *ene*, *medhye*, *tr̥ne*, *trdye*, *kanīnike*, *pārcve*, *çive*, *co'ttame*, *evo'ttare*, *çipre*, *rāthāntare*, *vatsarasya rūpe*, *virūpe*, *vishurūpe*, *sadohavirdhāne*, *adhishavane*, *ahorātre*, *dhṛtavrate*, *stutacastre*, *rksāme*, *akte*, *arpite*, *rāivate*, *pūrte*, *pratte*, *vidhrite*, *anrte*, *achidre*, *bahule*, *pūrvaje*, *kṛṇudhvāñ sadane*.

For the *prayrahās* catalogued in this rule—all of them dual cases of feminines and neuters—the commentator quotes illustrative passages as follows. For *devate*, *devate samrddhyāi midram* (ii.1.9<sup>3</sup>: the last word in G. M. only). For *ubhe*, G. M. have *achidre bahule ubhe*: *vyacasvatī sañvasāthām* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup>); but W. B. O., blunderingly, *ime eva rasend 'nakti* (vi.3.11<sup>3</sup>: B. O. have *ubhe* for *ime*): the word occurs also in other passages. For *bhāgadhe*, *bhāgadhe bhāgadhe asmād* (ii.5.6<sup>6</sup>): also in the preceding division of the same *anuvāka*, and at v.5.9<sup>2</sup>. As counter-example, to show that *dhe* (itself a *pada*, *bhāga-dhe*) would not have answered the purpose alone, we have *agna udadhe* (v.5.9<sup>1</sup>: *pada-text*, *uda-dhe*). For *ūrdhve*, *ūrdhve samidhāv ā dadhāti* (ii.6.6<sup>3</sup> and vi.2.1<sup>6</sup>). For *viçākhe*, *viçākhe nakshatram* (iv.4.10<sup>2</sup>): and as counter-example, to show the necessity of including the *vi* (of *viçākhe*), we have *tasmint sahasraçākhe*, stated to be found “in the text of another school.” About a score of such alleged citations from “another text,” assumed to have been had in view by the authors of the *Prātiçākhyā* in constructing their rules, are given in various parts of the commentary (five of them in the comment upon this rule): they will be put together, and their bearing discussed, in an additional note at the end of the work. For *çr̥nige*, *antard çr̥nige tam devatāh* (vi.2.8<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *devatāh*): the word also occurs at i.2.14<sup>7</sup>. The next two words, *ene* and *medhye*, occur in the same passage, *medhye evdi 'ne kuroti* (vi.2.9<sup>1</sup>), which the comment quotes, in W. O. giving *medhye* last, after the rest, by way of justifying the order in which the two words stand in the rule: but B. G. M. read the whole passage as it stands in the text, and G. M. make the rule read correspondingly *medhye ene* (T. has, like the others, *ene medhye*). *Ene* is also found in one or

11. —— etāni paddāni pragrahasamjñāni' syuh'. yathā: dev-  
---: achid---: bhāg---: bhādge<sup>8</sup> iti kim: agna---: ūr-  
---: viç---: vi<sup>4</sup> 'ti kim: tas--- iti çākhāntare<sup>9</sup>: ant---:  
ev---: me---: asam---: sam---: yad---: pār---:  
pit---: vik---: ce 'ti kim: sam---: tatho---: eve 'ti  
kim: nā---: pit---: yad---: samv---: sam---:  
vish---: vatsarasyavivishv<sup>10</sup> iti kim: arā---: 'rāpaçabdasya

two other passages (iv.6.2<sup>4</sup>: vi.2.9<sup>1</sup> again; 3.9<sup>6</sup>). For *trnne, asam-*  
*trnne hi hanū atho khalu* (vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the last two  
 words). For *trdye, samtrdye dhṛtyāi* (vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>). For *kaninike,*  
*yad atidātrāu kaninike agnishtomdu yat* (vii.2.9<sup>1</sup>: W. B. O. begin  
 at *kan-*): the same word occurs twice more in the next division.  
 For *pdr̥ve, pdr̥ve paraḥsamānah* (vii.3.10<sup>3</sup>): it is found a sec-  
 ond time in the same division. For *give, pitarah somyāsah give*  
*no dyāvāprthivi* (iv.6.8<sup>4</sup>: W. B. O. begin at *give*). For *co 'ttame,*  
*vikarṇīm co 'ttame upa dadhāti* (v.3.7<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the last  
 two words): and, to show the necessity of the *ca*, *samvatsaraṁ*  
*sampāḍyo 'ttame māsi* (vii.5.8<sup>1</sup>). For *evo 'ttare, tatho evo 'ttare*  
*nirvapet* (iii.4.9<sup>7</sup>): and, to show why *eva* had to be included in  
 the rule, *nāi 'ti shodācy uttare tena* (vii.1.4<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have  
*tena*). For *cipre, pitvā cipre avepayah* (i.4.30: W. B. O. begin  
 with *cipre*). For *rathāntare, yad bṛhadrathāntare anvarjeyuh*  
 (vii.5.3<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have *yad*): the same compound occurs in  
 several places elsewhere. For *vatsarasya rūpe, samvatsarasya*  
*rūpe āpnuvanti* (vii.5.1<sup>4</sup>). For *virūpe, samanāśa virūpe dhpā-*  
*yete* (iv.1.10<sup>4</sup>; 6.5<sup>2</sup>; 7.12<sup>3</sup>). For *vishurūpe, vishurūpe ahāni dyādur*  
*ivā'si* (iv.1.11<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. stop with *ahāni*). The necessity of  
 including in the rule, besides the *pada rūpe*, the words *vatsarasya*,  
*vishu* (of *vishu-rūpe*), and *vi* (of *vi-rūpe*) is proved by the citation  
 of *arūkshitām dṛga ā rūpe annam* (iv.8.13<sup>2</sup>), where *rūpe* is loca-  
 tive: and the commentary adds the remark (wanting, however, in  
 the South-Indian MSS.), "the separate specification of the word  
*rūpa* is to be looked upon as for the sake of distinct enunciation." For  
*sadohavirdhāne, sadohavirdhāne eva sam minoti* (ii.5.5<sup>5</sup>): the  
 compound occurs twice more, at vi.2.6<sup>2</sup>; 5.1<sup>5</sup>. To justify the 'in-  
 clusion of *sadah*, the commentator quotes *uparavā havirdhāne*  
*khādyante* (vi.2.11<sup>1</sup>); but the case appears to him one not to be so  
 easily disposed of, and he enters into an elaborate discussion of it,  
 which I defer to the end of this note, in order not to interrupt the  
 connection. For *adhishavane, hanū adhishavane jihvā* (vi.2.11<sup>4</sup>): it is also found in the preceding division of the same section, and  
 at iv.7.8<sup>1</sup>. The *adhi* is justified by reference to *stivanesavane 'bhi*  
*gr̥hnāti* (vi.4.11<sup>4</sup>; 6.11<sup>3</sup>). For *ahordtre, ahordtre prā 'viçan*  
 (i.5.9<sup>7</sup>): the word occurs not infrequently elsewhere. The passage  
*aiirdtre pacukāmasya* (vi.6.11<sup>4</sup>) is given to account for the inclusion  
 of *ahāh*; this implies, of course, that the Tāittirīya *pada*-text treats  
 the word as a separable compound, *ahāh-rātre*. For *dhṛtavrate,*  
*dyāvāprthivi dhṛtavrate dvinnā devi* (i.8.12<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last

---

*prativigeshanam uccāraṇavispashtārtham' drashtavyam': sad-*  
*---: sada iti kim: up---. nanu padagrahañeshu pa-*  
*dañ gamyeta* (i.50) *iti sāmarthyād 'dhavirdhāne ity ekapada-*  
*syāi 'va kāryasiddhih: sadahpadam vyartham. māi 'vam: pa-*  
*dagrahañe sthalāntare<sup>10</sup> bhinnarūpasya<sup>11</sup> sambhāvanāyām<sup>9</sup> vi-*  
*çeshañam sārthakam. bhavati<sup>12</sup>: bhinnarūpatvābhāve tu codyam*  
*etad bhavet<sup>13</sup> nanu tarhi devate iti padagrahañasya sthalāntare<sup>14</sup>*

word); and, to account for the inclusion of *dhr̥ta*, *yasya vrate* *pushtipatiḥ* (iii.1.11<sup>3</sup>). For *stutacastre*, *stutacastre evā 'tēna duhe* (v.6.8<sup>6</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): it occurs again at vii.3.13. This time, resort is had to “another text” (*cākhāntaram*) for a passage to explain why the rule does not say simply *castre*: it is *ārdhvē castre pratishthite*. For *rksāne*, *rksāne vā devehyah* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>): the word is found twice in this division, and also at vi.5.9<sup>2</sup>; 6.7<sup>4</sup>. Here, again, a passage in “another text,” *brahma sāme pratishthite* (G. M. omit the last word, and B. O. omit the *sā* of *sāme*), is appealed to in justification of the *rk*. For *akte*, *pu-rāravā gṛtend̄ kte vr̥shanam dadhāthām* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup> and [except *pu-rāravād̄*] vi.3.5<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first word, B. also the last). For *arpite*, *dyāvāprthivī bhuvaneshv arpīte* (iv.7.13<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the first word). For *rāvīte*, *gākvarardhāvīte sāmanī* (i.8.13<sup>2</sup> and iv.4.2<sup>3</sup>): the same compound is found again at iv.3.2<sup>3</sup>. For *pārte*, the different recensions give different examples: W. B. O. have *ishtāpūrte sañ srjethām* (iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>); G. M., *ishtāpūrte krnudat̄* (v.7.7<sup>2</sup>): I have noted no other cases: for the treatment of the word in the *pada*-text see the note to iii. 6. For *pratte*, *pratte kāmam annādyām duhāte* (v.4.9<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *vidhṛte*, again, W. B. O. have *vidhṛte sarvataḥ* (vi.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and G. M. *tasmān nāsikayā cakshushī vidhṛte samānī* (ii.3.8<sup>2</sup>), and the *vi* is justified by an alleged citation from “another text,” *agni-dhr̥te* (G. M., however, omitting the *agni*, thus leaving it to be understood that the simple word *dhr̥te* is found elsewhere not *pragraha*). For *anrte*, *satyānṛte avapacyan* (v.6.1<sup>1</sup>). For *achidre*, *achidre bahule ubhe* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have *ubhe*), which answers also for *bahule*: it is the only passage containing either word. For *pārvaje*, *pārvaje pitārā navyasibhiḥ* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>: W. B. O. omit the last word): another passage beginning with the same word is the subject of rule 23 of this chapter. Once more a word, *prathamaje*, is cited from “another text,” in order to explain why the rule does not say simply *je* (since the *pada*-text writes *pārvaje*). For *krnudhvān sadane*, finally, we have the sole passage in which it occurs, *gīrbhī krnudhvān sadune rtusya* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit *rtusya*), with the counter-example *apām tvā sadane sādayāmi* (iv.3.1: G. M. omit the last word), to show the necessity of *krnudhvām*.

To return, now, to the long word *sadohavirdhāne*. The objection is raised, that its part *sadah* is unnecessary, and that it would

---

*soma.... iti bhinnarūpatvād̄ viçeshanena bhavitavyam : tac ca nā 'sti. ucyate: devote ity akhandapadasyai 'va kāryavidhānād atra viçeshanām na yujyate: akhandavidhānam<sup>16</sup> iti katham pratiyate: te ity asya te mā patam* (iv.42) *ity ādindā prthakkarānād iti brāmah: nā<sup>17</sup> 'vām havirdhāne<sup>18</sup> ity asyā<sup>19</sup> 'khanḍatwadyotakanī<sup>20</sup> kiṁcid apy<sup>21</sup> aspi yena sadāpadavādiarthym dñambate<sup>22</sup>. hanū----: adhī 'ti kim: sav----: aho----: ahar iti kim: ati----: dyāv----: dhr̥te 'ti kim: yasya----: stu-*

have been sufficient to say *havirdhāne* simply; for rule i.50 teaches us that, in citations of *padas*, the cited *pada* alone is to be understood, not any collocation of words or letters phonetically equivalent with it: and *havirdhāne* is here a single *pada* (the compound being divided *sadāḥ-havirdhāne*, while its latter member, occurring by itself as a non-*pragraha*, is written *havīḥ-dhāne*, and so is a congeries of two *padas*). It is replied: not so; a distinctive addition is properly made to a cited *pada*, in case of its occurrence in a different form in another passage; though the objection would hold good, were it not for such occurrence in a different form. But this explanation is not suffered to pass without challenge. In that case, retorts the objector, a distinction ought to be added to *devate*, because it occurs elsewhere in a different form (made up of two independent words), as in *soma deva te matividah* (iii.2.5<sup>2,3</sup>); and no such addition is made. The answer is, that no distinction need here be applied to *devate*, because its treatment is defined as of an undivided word: and, if you ask how its indivisibility is established, we reply that rule 42, below, treats of *te* as a separate *pada* in the various situations in which it is *pragraha* [whence the inference is clear that it is here an inseparable part of the word *devate*]; while there is nothing whatever to show in like manner the indivisibility of *havirdhāne*, and so to prove the addition of *sadāḥ* superfluous. The implication is, that if the *pada* *dhāne* happened to be described elsewhere as *pragraha* after certain other *padas*, of which *havīḥ* was not one, then we could be sure that *havirdhāne* here meant a single undivided *pada*, and its mention by itself would be enough; while, as things are, one cannot be certain that its part *havīḥ* is not, like the *vi* and *vishu* of *virūpe* and *vishurūpe*, a distinctive addition.

अमीचक्षुषीकार्णीदिवताफल्गुनीमुष्टीधीनाभीवपाश-  
पणीश्रृङ्खनीजन्मनीसुम्निनीसामनविष्णवर्णेत्तवीदर्वी-  
घावापृथिवी ॥ १२ ॥

-----: stute 'ti kim: urdh---- iti gākhāntare: ḥks----: rg iti  
kim: brah---- iti gākhāntare: pur----: dyāv----: gāk v----:  
isht----: prat----: vidh----: vi 'ti kim: agn- iti gā-  
khāntare: <sup>23</sup>saty----: ach----: pūrv----: pūrve 'ti kim:  
prath- iti gākhāntare: <sup>23</sup> gīr----: kṛṇudhvam iti kim: apām  
-----

<sup>1</sup> O. *pragṛhyas-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *bhavanti*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *bhāgadhe*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *viṣikhe*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-ram*. <sup>6</sup> W. O. *vatsaraviv-*. <sup>(7)</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>8</sup> B. -nānū *vi-*; W. O. *-tha*. <sup>(9)</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>10</sup> MSS. *sthil-*. <sup>11</sup> W. -*patram*. <sup>12</sup> B. G. M. *om*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>14</sup> B. *sthil-*. <sup>15</sup> W. B. O. *abh-*. <sup>16</sup> B. O. -*ḍlitavi-*. <sup>17</sup> W. B. O. *mādi*. <sup>18</sup> W. B. O. *sadoh-*. <sup>19</sup> W. *asā*; B. *ā*; O. *om*. <sup>20</sup> W. B. O. *ins. na*. <sup>21</sup> W. B. O. *tathā*. <sup>22</sup> B. -*nibyate*; O. -*nibhyate*; G. M. *āpadyate*. <sup>(23)</sup> B. *om*.

12. Also *amī*, *cakshushī*, *kārshṇī*, *devatā phalgunī*, *mushtī*, *dhi*, *nābhī*, *vapāgrapanī*, *ahani*, *janmānī*, *sumnīnī*, *sāmanī*, *vāishṇavī*, *aikshavī*, *darvī*, *dyāvāprthivī*.

The illustrative passages cited under this rule are as follows. For *amī*, according to W. B. O., *amī vā idam abhāvan* (iii.3.7<sup>1</sup>); but according to G. M., *amī tvā jahati* (iii.2.11<sup>2</sup>): I have noted elsewhere only vi.1.5<sup>4</sup>. For *cakshushī*, *cakshushi vā ete yajñasya* (ii.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.: G. M. omit *yajñasya*): the word occurs about a dozen times. For *kārshṇī*, *kārshṇī upānahāv. upa muñcate* (v.4.4<sup>4</sup>; 6.6<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words). For *phalgunī*, *pitaro devatā phalgunī nakshatram* (iv.4.10<sup>1</sup>): again in the next division of the same section. To show the necessity of including *devatā* in the rule, is given *yad dvitiyañ sā phalgunī* (ii.1.2<sup>2</sup>). For *mushtī*, *mushtī karoti vācam* (v.2.1<sup>7</sup> and vi.1.4<sup>8</sup>: G. M. omit *vācam*). For *dhi*, *pradhī tāv ukthyā madhye* (vii.4.11<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *madhye*). For *nābhī*, *rajatānābhī vāigvadevāu* (v.5.24). For *vapāgrapanī*, *vapāgrapanī pru harati* (vi.3.9<sup>6</sup>): it occurs also in the fourth division of the same section. As counter-example, to explain the presence of *vapā* in the rule, is given, "from another text," the compound *pacugrapanī* (or, as G. M. read, *bhasma-grapanī*): our Sanhitā has *pacugrapanam* at iii.1.3<sup>2</sup>. For *ahani*, *ahani dyāur ivā 'si* (iv.1.11<sup>3</sup>). For *janmānī*, *ubhe ni pāsi janmānī* (i.4.22). For *sumnīnī*, *sumndya sumnīnī* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>). For *sāmanī*, *sāmanī pratishthitydi* (iv.4.2<sup>8</sup>): also at i.8.13<sup>2</sup>. For *vāishṇavī*, *valagahunāv vāishṇavī bṛhann asi* (i.3.2<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words). For *aikshavī*, *aikshavī tirācī* (vi.2.1<sup>5</sup> twice). For *darvī*, *durvī grīñisha ḫsāni* (ii.2.12<sup>7</sup> and iv.4.4<sup>6</sup>). For *dyāvāprthivī*, *dyāvāprthivī era svena* (ii.1.4<sup>7</sup>): the word is frequently found elsewhere. The commentator gives us here also a counter-example, *mahi dyāuh prthivī ca nah* (iii.3.10<sup>2</sup> et al.: G. M. omit *ca nah*), as if the inclusion of *dyāvā* required justification: but, in ordinary Vedic usage (I have omitted to inform myself in season respecting that of the Tāittirīya *pūda*-text), *dyāvāprthivī* is inseparable, and therefore itself a single *pūda*.

## पूर्वश्च ॥ १३ ॥

13. As also, the preceding word.

That is to say (by the application of rule i.58), the word preceding the last one mentioned in the rule next above, or *dyāvāprthi-*

12. .... <sup>1</sup> *etāni paddāni pragrahushumjñāni syuh<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>:*  
*amī*....: *caksh*....: *kārsh*....: *pit*....: *devate* 'ti *kim*:  
*yad*....: *musht*....: *pra*....: *raj*....: *vap*....: *vape* 'ti  
*kim*: *pac*.... *iti gākhāntare*: *ah*....: *ubhe*....: *sum*....:  
*sām*....: *val*....: *aiksh*....: *dar*....: *dyāv*....: *dyāver*  
*'ti kim*: *mahi*....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. *bhavanti*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. O. om.

vñ. The examples given are *yāvati dyāvāprthivī mahitvā* (iii.2.6<sup>1</sup>), and *āvinne dyāvāprthivī* (i.8.12<sup>2</sup>: G. M. invert the order of the two citations): I have noted only two other cases of the application of the rule, at ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>; 6.7<sup>5</sup>.

## न रुद्धे नित्यम् ॥ १४ ॥

### 14. But not *rundhe*, in any case.

The case intended to be excluded is quoted by the commentator: *pagūn evā'va rundhe dyāvāprthivī gacha svāhā* (vi.4.1<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first three words and the last). The specification *nityam*, ‘constantly, in all cases,’ is intended to exclude also the operation of any other rule under which *rundhe* might chance to fall: for example, in *rundhe yaddi sahasram* (ii.1.5<sup>2</sup>), where, as preceding *yaddi*, it would otherwise be *pragraha* by rule 38 of this chapter. I have noted no other case.

## हरीसङ्करीसङ्कर्तीकल्पयतीश्चापृष्ठतीश्चाङ्गती ॥ १५ ॥

### 15. Also *hari*, *sahuri*, *sahuti*, *kalpayanti*, & *prshati*, and *āhutī* are *pragraha*.

The cited examples are as follows. For *hari*, *hari te yuñjā prshati abhatām* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>: <sup>1</sup>. M. omit the last two words): it occurs in toward a dozen other passages. For *sahuri*, *sahuri saparyāt* (iv.2.11<sup>1</sup>); and the counter-example, to show the necessity of the *sa*, *tam āhuri hwayante* (but O. reads *tām*, B. *hwayate*, and G. M. *āhuri vācayati*), claimed to be found “in another text.” This would imply, of course, that the *pada-text* reads *su-huri*—as is in fact the case. For *sahuti*, *sahuti vanatām giruh* (ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>); and, as counter-example, for the same purpose as the last, *huti punar juhoti* (but G. M. read *manur* for *punar*), also from “another text.” For *kalpayanti*, *adhvarām kalpayanti irdhvām yajñam* (i.2.13<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word, and W. B. O. the last): another case is found at vi.2.9<sup>3</sup>. For *ā prshati*, the passage already quoted for *hari*, *yuñjā prshati abhatām* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>); and, to justify the *ā*, the counter-example *prshati sthālaprshati* (v.6.12). For *āhutī*, *purodācam ete āhutī juhoti* (i.5.2<sup>3-4</sup>: G. M. omit the first two words, W. B. O. the last): nearly the same phrase occurs again at

13. cakārenā 'nvādishtadyāvāprthivī ity usmāt<sup>1</sup> pūrvo 'pi "kāra ekāro<sup>2</sup> vā paddantāḥ pragraho bhavati. yudhā: yāv-----: av-----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. etasmāt. <sup>2</sup> G. M. put before *ikārah*.

14. *rundhe* ity antyasvaro<sup>1</sup> dyāvāprthivī ity etasmāt pūrvo 'pi na pragraho bhavati: pagūn----- nityaçabdaḥ prāptyantara-nishedhārthāḥ: *rundhe-----: viddādi*<sup>2</sup> (iv.38) *prāptih*.

<sup>1</sup> W. *antasv-*; B. O. *antaḥ sv-*. <sup>2</sup> O. *viddvārāv iti*.

i.5.4<sup>4</sup>. To account for the *ā* in this word, G. M. simply cite *hutī* as found in "another text:" but W. B. O. give the phrase *hutī tasmād evāh* (but W. O. read *hutī*, and B. *ddhatī*: W. also has *vivā iti* instead of *evā iti*).

## पूर्वश्च ॥ १६ ॥

16. As also, the preceding word.

Namely *ete*, occurring before *āhutī* in the passage already quoted: *puroḍḍagam ete āhutī* (i.5.2<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. here omit the first word).

## वाससीतपसीरोदसी ॥ १७ ॥

17. Also *vāsasī*, *tapasī*, and *rodasī*.

The examples are: *vāsasī iva vivasāndū* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>: the word is also found at i.8.18); *sākshād eva dīkshātapasī avā rundhe* (vi.1.1<sup>2</sup>: the compound occurs again in the same division: only G. M. have the first two words); and *ime vāi rodasī tayoh* (v.1.5<sup>4</sup>: G. M. have dropped out *vāi*): the word is not rarely met with elsewhere.

## परश्च ॥ १८ ॥

18. As also, the following word.

The passage contemplated by the rule is, as cited in the comment, *anv indrañ rodasī vāvāgāne* (i.7.13<sup>1</sup>): there is, I believe, no other falling under it.

15. .... <sup>1</sup> *eteshv antyasvaraḥ<sup>2</sup>* *pragrahah syāt<sup>3</sup>*: *hari*....: *sah*....: *se* 'ti *kim*: *tam*.... *iti* *gākhāntare*: *sah*....: *se* 'ti *kim*: *hutī*.... *iti* *gākhāntare*: *adhv*....: *yunjā*....: 'e 'ti' *kim*: *prsh*....: *puro*....: *e* 'ti *kim*: *hutī*.... *iti* *gākhāntare*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *antyah sv.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. *bhavati*. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. *ākureṇa*.

16. *cakārānvādeśād<sup>1</sup>* *āhutī ity etasmāt pūrva* <sup>2</sup>*ikāra ekāro vā padāntah<sup>3</sup>* *pragraho bhavati*. *yathā*: *pur*....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*anvādishā*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. om.

17. <sup>1</sup>.... *ity etāni pragrahasamjñāni bhavanti*<sup>3</sup>. *yathā*: *vās*....: *sāk*....: *ime*....

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. *eshv antyasvaraḥ pragraho bhavati*.

18. *cakārānvādīshītarodusī<sup>1</sup>* *ity etasmāt para* <sup>2</sup>*ikāra ekāro vā padāntah<sup>3</sup>* *pragraho bhavati*. *yathā*: *anv*....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*ād ro*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. om.

**व्यचस्वतीभरिष्यतीनःपृथिवी ॥१६॥**

19. Also *vyacasvatī*, *bharishyantī*, and *nah prthivi*.

The examples are: *vyacasvatī sam̄ vasdthām* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup>); *agnim antar bharishyantī jyotishmantam* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup>: G. alone has the last word); and *dyāvā nah prthivi imāñ sidhram* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>). The needed counter-example for the last is supplied by *rejate agne prthivi makhebhyaḥ* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>).

**ये अप्रथेता मुर्वी तिग्रस्य पञ्चक्रन्दसी क्लन्दस्वती तिग्राचरती अ-  
तरैतास् ॥२०॥**

20. Also in the verses beginning *ye aprathetām*, *urvi*, *te asya*, *yam krandasī*, *chandasvatī*, *te ācaranti*, and *antarā*.

The commentator cites only the beginning of each verse, as a word with *pragraha* final occurs at or near the beginning in every case. Thus: *ye aprathetām amitebhīḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>: there are three other cases of *pragrahas* in the verse); with the counter-example *ye te panthānāḥ* (vii.5.24), to show that *ye* alone would not have defined the verse; *urvi rodasī varivāḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>: G. M. omit the last word: three cases, besides *rodasī*, already disposed of by rule 17); *te asya yoshūṇe* (iv.1.8<sup>2</sup>: one more case: the *te* is therefore made no account of in rule 42, below); with the counter-example *te 'vardhanta svutavaso mahitvānd* (iv.1.11<sup>3</sup>), to show the necessity of *asya*; *yam krundasī avasā* (iv.1.8<sup>5</sup>: contains two other cases); and, as counter-example, for a like purpose, *yam agne pṛtsu martyam* (i.3.13<sup>2</sup>); *chandusratī ushasā* (iv.3.11<sup>1</sup>: it contains seven cases); *te ācaranti* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>: also seven cases); with *te no arvanto havanagṛutāḥ* (i.7.8<sup>2</sup>) as counter-example, to prove that *te* alone would not be enough; and, finally, *untarā mitrāvarunā carunti* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>: with four cases).

**नोपस्थे ॥२१॥**

21. But not *upasthe*.

19. .... <sup>1</sup>*eteshv<sup>1</sup>* *antyasvārah<sup>2</sup>* *padāntah<sup>3</sup>* *pragraho bhavati*.  
*yathā*: *vyac-*....: *agn-*....: *dyāvā*....<sup>4</sup>: *na iti kim*: *rej-*....

<sup>1</sup> G. *eshv.* <sup>2</sup> B. *-tyah sv-*. <sup>3</sup> G. om. <sup>(4)</sup> M. om.

20. .... *etāsv ṛkshv ikāra ekāro<sup>1</sup>* *vā padāntah pragraho bhavati*. *yathā*: *ye*....: *apruthetām iti kim*: *ye te*....: *urvi*....: *te*....: *asye 'ti kim*: *te 'v*....: *yam*....: *krandasī iti kim*: *yam*....: *chand-*....: *te ā-*....: *ācaranti iti kim*: *te no*....: *ant-*....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put before *ikāro*.

That is to say, *upasthe* is exempted from the action of the preceding rule: it occurs but once in the verses forming the subject of that rule, namely in *māte 'va putram bibhṛtām upasthe* (in the verse beginning *te ācaranti*, iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>: W. B. O. give only the last two words). To show that *sthe* would not have sufficiently defined the -exception (*upa-sthe*), the commentator quotes *ye pratiṣṭhē* (*prati-sthe*) *abhuvatām* (from the verse beginning with *urvi*, iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>).

## इरावतीप्रभृत्या दाधार ॥ २२ ॥

22. Also in the passage beginning with *irāvati*, and ending with *dādhāra*.

The passage in question is found at i.2.13<sup>2</sup>, and contains six *pragrahas*, whereof one, *rodasi*, needs no further provision than was made in rule 17, above; it also contains a word in *e*, *manave*, which is not *pragraha*, being excepted by rule 54. The commentator quotes its beginning, *irāvati dhenumatī hi bhūtam*.

## पूर्वजेप्रभृत्यायम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. And in the passage beginning with *pūrvaje* and ending with *ayam*.

Of this passage, found at ii.6.7<sup>5</sup>, the commentator quotes the first four words. In order to the better understanding of the following discussion, I set it down here in full, along with the word that precedes it: *hvayate pūrvaje rtāvarī ity dha pūrvaje hy ete rtāvuri devī devaputre ity dha devī hy ete devaputre upahūto 'yam*. It contains ten *pragraha* endings, of which, however, two (*pūrvaje*) fall under rule 11, above. The word *ā*, 'as far as,' in the rule, is declared here to exclude the two limiting words mentioned (com-

21. *etāsv rkhū 'pasthe ity antyasvarah<sup>1</sup> padāntah<sup>2</sup> prugraho na bhavati. yathā: māt----- upe 'ti kim: ye-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *antah sv-*.   <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

22. *irāvatiprabhrtī 'rāvati iti' gaddam ārabhyā " dādhāra dādhāraçabdaparyantam<sup>3</sup> ikāra ekāro vā padāntah prugraho bhavati. yathā: irā-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.   <sup>2</sup> W. B. O. *paryantam*.

23. *pūrvajeprabhṛtyayamparyantam<sup>1</sup> ikāra ekāro vā padāntah prugraho bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: pūrv----- ānipadam<sup>3</sup> maryādāyāmīn vartate. nanu pūrv----- ity ārabhyā 'yam---- ity etatparyantam sthalam<sup>4</sup> etatsūtruvishayah<sup>5</sup> kim na syāt. ucyate: bhāratpaksha upabandhāntahpātitivdt<sup>6</sup> kṛṇudhvān sadane (iv.11) iti grahanasya<sup>7</sup> vāiyarthyam<sup>8</sup> "syāt: tun<sup>9</sup> mā bhūd iti: tasmād*

pare Pāṇini ii.1.18)—an arbitrary restriction, directly opposed by the analogy of the preceding rule; intended, doubtless, to relieve the treatise of the reproach of declaring the word *pūrvaje* a *pragraha* by two separate rules; but this is a small gain, since the same word occurs a second time in the passage, and cannot there be reached by any such device.

A protracted, not to say tedious, discussion now arises, respecting the sufficiency and propriety of the rule as stated. The first objection is: how do we know that the passage had in view by the rule is not that which begins with *pūrraje piturā* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>) and ends with *ayam purobhūrah* (iv.3.2<sup>1</sup>: B. O. omit *bhuvah*). Because, it is answered, the special citation (in rule 11) of *kṛṇudhrañ sadane* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>), which occurs within the limits mentioned, would in that case be rendered superfluous. Objection second: the word *pūrvaje*, at any rate, is useless, it having been already made *pragraha* by rule 11; the rule should read “beginning with *vori*” (the concluding *poda* of the separable compound *rta-vori*). This, too, is repelled: the rule reads as it stands because *vori* occurs twice in the passage, and the question would arise where the defined limit should be understood to be: moreover, as we are taught (i.25) in case of doubt to take the nearest, we should have to assume as intended the latter of the two, as being nearer to the other specified limit: in which case we should arrive at the untoward result that the *pragraha* character of the first *vori* would not be established at all. But now the objector triumphantly retorts, that there are also two instances of *pūrraje*, and a like doubt as in the supposition last made would arise as to the identity of the one cited, and a like untoward result as was pointed out in connection therewith. Not so, is the defense: *pūrraje* is not desig-

---

*etat<sup>8</sup> sthalam etutsūtruvishayo na bhavati. nam atro pūrvajegrahāṇam anarthakam: pūrvajekṛṇudhvōśadane (iv.11) iti tatrāi 'vo 'ktatvāt: <sup>10</sup>kim tu<sup>10</sup> varīprabhṛty<sup>11</sup> etāratāi 'vā 'lom. ne 'ti brāhmaḥ: varīgrahanadvayasambhavāt: kutra vā 'vadhi- niyamatvena<sup>12</sup> svikāra<sup>13</sup> iti saṁdehāḥ syot: kim ca: āsunnañ saṁdehe (i.25) iti vacunāt uttarāvadhisamnīkṛṣhī<sup>14</sup>. dvitīyava- rīcēbda eva svikartavyaḥ: totā soti pūrvavarīcēbdēsyā<sup>15</sup> prā- grahutvām na syit: tac ca 'nishtam. nanu bhavonmate 'pi pūrvajedvayusumbharāt kutra vā grahāṇam iti saṁdehāḥ samā- nuḥ: kim ca: yuktyuktam<sup>16</sup> anishtam ca<sup>17</sup> samānum<sup>18</sup>. māi 'vam: pūrvaje iti padam utra kāryabhadrvē<sup>19</sup> no 'cyate<sup>20</sup> yena pādānāruktyum bhavet: kim tu pūrvajē ca 'sāu jegabdaç ca pūrvaje: etutprabhṛti 'ty<sup>21</sup> upalakshakatveno<sup>22</sup> 'cyate<sup>20</sup>. nanu tar- hy<sup>23</sup> upahāta iti padam atikrumyā 'yam ity avadhitvena kimar- tham<sup>24</sup> ucyate: <sup>25</sup>upahāta iti padānām bālālye <sup>26</sup> 'py āsannāñ saṁdehe (i.25) iti vacunāt prāthamikusyāi 'va grahāṇusiddhī<sup>27</sup>. māi 'vam<sup>28</sup>: upahāta iti padagrahāṇe<sup>28</sup> tatra<sup>29</sup> gāuravudoshāḥ:*

nated by the rule as a word possessing the defined quality—which would indeed be a superfluous repetition (in view of rule 11); but it means ‘the former *je* of the two,’ and is given merely as a convenient limit to count forward from! Again: why, at the end of the passage, is *ayam* pitched upon as limit, to the neglect of *upa-hūtāḥ*; for, though this word is found several times in the immediate sequel, yet, in virtue of the principle already appealed to, “in case of doubt, take the nearest” (125), its first occurrence would be distinctly enough the one intended. This also is disallowed: to quote the whole compound word *upa-hūtāḥ* (*pada*-text, *upa-hūtāḥ*) would be to incur the charge of excess; and as for *upa* by itself, the first member of the compound, though it be a *pada*, its *pada* quality is of secondary rank, while that of *ayam* is primary [the latter being a complete word, but the former only a somewhat artificially separated portion of such]; hence, on the principle “where there is a primary, a secondary is not in place,” it was proper to cite *ayam*. The answer, however, suggests the further objection that, on the same principle, the first limit is unsuitable [*je* being also a fragment of a word; and its predecessor *hvayate* should have been taken instead]. That cannot be made good, is the reply; for there is a want of suitableness in the primary word suggested: if you take the primary *hvayate*, then, on the supposition that the definition of limits is to be understood inclusively [*a* being susceptible of both an inclusive and an exclusive interpretation], this word [as it ends in *e*] will appear to be cited as a *pragruha*: which is wrong. And if you urge that rule 54 of the chapter annuls this false inference, we reply that, on the principle “not to touch filth is far better than to wash it off,” it is better not

---

*upe 'ty etāvanmātrasyā "dibhūtasyā" 'nçasya<sup>1</sup> padatvām gṛu-nam: ayam ity asya tu<sup>2</sup> mukhyam: mukhye sambhavati na garu-nam iti nyāyād ayam iti yuktam grahanam. nanv etendi 'va nyāyend<sup>3</sup> "dyāvadher<sup>4</sup> anupapannata. nād 'yam pakshah: mu-khyasambhavābhāvāt<sup>5</sup>: tathā hi: hvayata iti mukhye svikrte bhividhinyāyena tasyā 'pi grahanam<sup>6</sup> syāt: tac ca 'niṣṭam: ate samānapade (iv.54) iti vacanād etad<sup>7</sup> anishṭam na<sup>8</sup> bhava-vi<sup>9</sup> 'ti<sup>10</sup> cet: prakshālanād dhi pañkasyā dārad asparçanam varum iti nyāyād dhvayata ity uccārya tasya nishedhakathānād api tadanuccāraṇam eva ramāṇyam<sup>11</sup>. iti mukhyasambhavā-bhāvo 'vastha<sup>12</sup> eva: tasmād asmint sūtre 'nupapattilego nā 'sti.*

<sup>1</sup> W. O. -ti à *ayam*; B. -ti *ayam*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *idam*. <sup>4</sup> B. O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. O. sātr-; G. M. -*yam*. <sup>6</sup> W. ins. *pūrvaje*. <sup>7</sup> W. *pragrahasya*. <sup>8</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> B. om. <sup>11</sup> W. B. *rūvarī*. <sup>12</sup> W. *vidhi*; G. M. -*dhitvena*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *svikriyatā*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *uktāvā*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. ins. *ca*. <sup>16</sup> W. O. *yuktīyuktam*: G. M. *yad uktam*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. om. <sup>18</sup> B. O. *tulyam*. <sup>19</sup> B. O. -*te*. <sup>20</sup> B. om. <sup>21</sup> G. M. om. <sup>22</sup> G. M. -*kshayanat*. <sup>23</sup> G. M. om. <sup>24</sup> G. M. *kim*. <sup>25</sup> B. om. <sup>26</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>27</sup> G. M. -*dheh*. <sup>28</sup> G. M. om. *pada*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. *sūtra*. <sup>30</sup> W. G. M. om. <sup>31</sup> W. 'nçabdasya'; G. M. *īngyāñc-*. <sup>32</sup> G. M. om. <sup>33</sup> B. O. -*dyapadasya*. <sup>34</sup> O. G. M. -*khye s-*. <sup>35</sup> G. M. *pragrahawān*. <sup>36</sup> G. M. *tad*. <sup>37</sup> G. M. om. <sup>38</sup> G. M. om. *iti*. <sup>39</sup> W. *svar-*; B. O. *varam*. <sup>40</sup> G. M. *tadav-*.

to quote *hvayate* at all than to quote it and then make it the subject of an exception. The case, then, is one where no suitable primary word is to be found; and not the slightest charge of impropriety can be maintained against the rule as given.

Both parties to this controversy are about equally open to the charge of hair-splitting absurdity; but the objector must be acknowledged to have the right of it so far as this—that the rule is really ambiguous, considering the presence of the two words *pūrvaje*. That *pūrvaje*, as used in it, means ‘the former *je*,’ I do not at all believe.

### इमे गर्भमुपैवरसेनपरः ॥ २४ ॥

24. Also *ime*, when followed by *garbhām*, *upa*, and *eva rasena*.

The passages referred to are: *yad ime garbhām adadhātām* (iii.4.3<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), *ime upāvartsyataḥ* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>), and *ime eva rasena nakti* (vi.3.11<sup>3</sup>). Two counter-examples are given: one to show the necessity of *rasena* after *eva*, *ima evā smāi lokāḥ* (ii.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and one to show in general the need of specifying the situations in which *ime* is *pragraha*, *adhvartavyā vā* *ime devāḥ* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>).

### क्रूरमापः सञ्जूर्बक्षितेषु च ॥ २५ ॥

25. As also, in the sections beginning with *krūram*, *āpah*, *sajūḥ*, and *brahma ja*.

That is to say, *ime* in the sections specified is always *pragraha*, even when otherwise followed than by the words mentioned in the preceding rule. The commentator quotes the beginning words of each section, and a single example from each: thus, from the section *krūram iva vdi* (v.1.5: only G. M. have the last two words), *rodasyor ity dhe 'me vdi rodasi* (v.1.5<sup>4</sup>: the only case in the sec-

24. *ime ity antyasvaro garbhāḥ*: *upa*: *eva rasena*: *evamparāh padāntāḥ*<sup>1</sup> *pragrahāḥ syāt*. *yathā*: *yad*—: *ime*—: *ime*— *rasene 'ti kim*: *ima*—: *evampara iti kim*: *adhv*—

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

25. *ime iti caçabdo<sup>2</sup> 'nvādiçati*: *krūram*: *āpah*: *sajūḥ*: *brahma ja*: <sup>3</sup>*eteshv anuvākeshv ime ity antyasvarah pārvoktaparanimitatābhāve<sup>3</sup> pi pragraho bhavati*. *krū*— *ity atra yathā*<sup>4</sup>: *rod*— *apo*— *ity atre 'me*—<sup>2</sup> *saj*— *ity atra yathā*<sup>5</sup>: *eta*— *brah*— *ity atra yathā*: *na*—: *je 'ti kim*: *brah*— *ity atra trayā*— *ity asya<sup>6</sup> pragrahatvam mā bhād iti*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put before *ime*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. jñāneshw. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. *para*. <sup>4</sup> B. O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. O. G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> B. om.; G. M. *atra*.

tion: B. O. begin the citation at *ime*); from the section *āpo varunasyu patnuyah* (v.5.4: G. M. omit the last word), *ime ero 'pu dhatte* (v.5.4<sup>1</sup>: there are two more cases in the following divisions); from the section *sajūr ubduḥ* (v.6.4: G. M. omit the last word), *etaça ime ṣaḍvī samiratsarah* (v.6.4<sup>1</sup>: the only case: only G. M. have the first word); from the section *brahma jajñānam* (v.2.7), *na hī 'me yajushā "ptum arhati* (v.2.7<sup>4</sup>: the only case: B. O. omit the last word). The last calls for a counter-example, to show the need of including in the rule the syllable after *brahma*: there is another section beginning *brahmādīno vadanty adbhīḥ* (ii.6.5: B. O. omit *adbhīḥ*), which contains an *ime* not *pragraha*: *traya ime lokāḥ* (ii.6.5<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have *trayah*).

## पूर्णे च ॥ २६ ॥

26. As also *pūrṇe*.

The *eu*, 'and,' in this rule merely brings down the heading of the last *anuvāka* named in the one preceding. In that *anuvāka*, *pūrṇe* is *pragraha*: to wit, in *pūrṇe upa dadhāti pūrṇe evā 'nam* (v.2.7<sup>4</sup>); but not elsewhere, as for example in *yo vāi pūrṇa ḍsiñcati* (vii.5.6<sup>1</sup>).

## दृढे ॥ २७ ॥

27. Also *dṛḍhe* is *pragraha*.

The restrictions imposed in previous rules no longer hold good: *dṛḍhe* is *pragraha* wherever met with. The example given is *yena dydur ugrā pr̥thivī ca dṛḍhe* (iv.1.8<sup>5</sup>). There is another case at iii.2.4<sup>3</sup>.

## घीचक्रे पपरे ॥ २८ ॥

28. Also *ghnī* and *cakre*, when followed by *p*.

26. *caṣabdo brahmajajñānam ity anvādiçati: pūrṇe ity antya svaro brahmajajñānam ity anuvāke pragraho bhavati. yathā:* *pūrṇe*.... <sup>2</sup>*asminn anuvāka<sup>2</sup> iti kim: yo*....

<sup>1</sup> B. O. G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *brahmaja*.

27. *dṛḍhe ity asminn<sup>1</sup> antyasvarah sarvatra<sup>2</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>3</sup>: yena*....

<sup>1</sup> B. O. om. <sup>2</sup> B. O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. O. G. M. om.

28. *ghnī: cakre: ity<sup>1</sup> ete pade papare pragrahe<sup>2</sup> bhavataḥ. vār*....: *cakre*.... *papare iti kim: yad*....: *śūm*.... *ghnīcakre iti kim: cak*....: *ye*.... *pakārah<sup>3</sup> paro yābhyañi te papare.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-gṛhye*. <sup>3</sup> W. *pah*.

The examples are: *vârtraghnî pûrnamâse* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup>); *cakre prsh-thâni* (vi.6.8<sup>1</sup>): I have noted no other cases. We have then two pairs of counter-examples, to show that these words are *pragrahu* before *p* only, and only these words before *p*: the first pair are *yad virupayâ vârtraghnî syât* (vi.1.6<sup>7</sup>) and *samidhâna cakre nicl tam* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>: only W. has *tam*); the second, *çakâ bhâumî pântrah* (v.5.18) and *yeshâm îce paçupatih* (iii.1.4<sup>1-2</sup>).

## न्वती ॥ २९ ॥

29. Also *nvati*.

Two examples are cited: *omanvatî te 'smîn* (ii.6.9<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words), and *vrdhanvatî amâvâsyâyâm* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup>): also a counter-example, proving that *vati* alone would not have been sufficient: *karnakâvaty etayâ* (v.4.7<sup>3</sup>).

## पपरो न ॥ ३० ॥

30. But not when followed by *p*

The case here excepted—the only one, so far as I have noticed—is *mûrdhanvatî puronuvâkyâ bhavati* (ii.6.2<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word).

## समीची ॥ ३१ ॥

31. *Samîcî* is *pragraha*.

For this word, G. M. cite *samîcî retah siñcatah* (v.5.4<sup>2</sup>); B. O. cite *paçcât samîcî tabhih* (v.2.3<sup>5</sup>); W. gives both passages. The word is met with a dozen times or more in the *Sanhita*.

## नपरो न ॥ ३२ ॥

29. *nvati ity antyasvaraḥ<sup>1</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: om-----: vṛdh----- nakârena kim: karn-----.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *antah s-*; O. *antaś-*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. G. M. *om*.

30. *sâmnidhyânvatî iti<sup>1</sup> labhyate: paparo nvati ity<sup>2</sup> antyasvaraḥ<sup>3</sup> pragraho na bhavati. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: mûr-----.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *om*. <sup>2</sup> B. *om*. <sup>3</sup> B. *antah s-*; O. *antas-*. <sup>4</sup> B. O. G. M. *om*.

31. *samîcî ity antyasvaraḥ<sup>1</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: sam-----: paç-----.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *antas-*; O. *antyah s-*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. G. M. *om*.

32. *sâmnidhyânt samîcî iti labhyate: na khalu samîcî ity antyasvaraḥ nakâraparâḥ<sup>1</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: sam-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>2</sup> W. G. M. *om*.

32. But not when followed by *n*.

The case excepted is *samīcī nāmād' si* (v.5.10<sup>1</sup>). I have noted no other.

### ची यत्प्रपरः ॥३२॥

33. *Cī* is *pragraha*, when followed by *yat* or *pra*.

The passages had in view by this rule are: *āikshāvī tiraçcī yad  
āgravālāh* (vi.2.1<sup>5</sup>: W. O. omit the first word, G. M. B. the last; and B. has the citation out of place, after the next but one), and *prācī pretam udhvaram* (i.2.13<sup>2</sup> and vi.2.9<sup>3</sup>); besides two other cases before *pra* at vi.2.1<sup>5</sup>; 3.9<sup>6</sup>. The commentator gives in addition a number of counter-examples: to show that *cī* is not always *pragraha*, *prācī dīcām* (iv.3.8<sup>1</sup> et al.: but W. B. O. read instead *yā prācī dīk*, which is not to be found in the Sanhitā: *prācī dīk*, without *yā*, occurs at several places, e. g. iv.3.6<sup>2</sup>); to prove the necessity of the *t* of *yat* and the *r* of *pra*, *gāur ghṛtācī yujñō de-vān jigāti* (ii.5.7<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words) and *tas-māt puçcāt prācī patny anv āste* (v.3.7<sup>5</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words); to indicate that other endings than *cī* are not *pragraha* in the situations specified, *yad agnir vajra ekidacīnī yad  
agnāu* (v.5.7<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first three words) and *pru-janane prajananañ hi vā* (i.5.9<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words).

### आन्मस्ती ॥३४॥

34. Also *ān mahī*.

The passage is *mākān mahī astabhāyat* (ii.3.14<sup>6</sup>). Elsewhere, *mahī* is not *pragraha*: e. g. in *mahī dyāuh pṛthivi ca naḥ* (iii.3.10<sup>2</sup> et al.: G. M. omit the last two words); and even after *n* preceded by any other vowel than *a*: e. g. in *vayunāvid eka in  
mahī devasya* (i.2.13<sup>1</sup> and iv.1.11<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word).

### पती श्रुतिः ॥३५॥

33. *cī ity antyasvaro yatparāḥ praparo vā pragrahāḥ syāt.  
yathāः āikshā..... prā..... evamparū iti kim: prā..... ta-kārarephābhyañm kim: gāur..... tas-..... cī 'ti kim: yad-..... praj-.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *bhavati*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

34. *ān ity etadvigishte māhīgrahaṇe 'ntyasvarāḥ pragrahāḥ  
syāt. yathāः mahī..... ān iti kim: mahī..... ākārena kim:  
vay-.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *bhavati*.

35. Also the combination of sounds *pati*.

The commentator explains: wherever there is *gruti*, i. e. ‘hearing,’ of *pati*, there we are to understand a case of *pragraha*-quality. Hitherto we have been dealing only with *padas*, or complete individual words; but the *i* of *pati* is uncombinable, even when that audible combination is only a part of a *pada*. The selected examples are, first, *dvāu pati vindate* (vi.6.4<sup>3</sup>) and *gubhas pati idam aham* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the last word), where *pati* is a *pada*; then *yam aṣṭirū dampati vāmam aṣṇutah* (iii.2.8<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words) and *priyan indrābṛhaspati* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>), where it is part of a *pada*: there are a few other cases.

It is remarked at the end of the comment, that, from this rule on, parts of words are also subjects of prescription of *pragraha*-quality.

ग्नी ॥ ३६ ॥

36. Also *gnī*.

I have noted a number of cases of *gnī* as dual of *agnī* and its compounds. The commentator gives two: *antaragnī paśūndām* (i.6.7<sup>1</sup>), and *vīcavāmitrajamadagnī vasishthena* (iii.1.7<sup>3</sup> and v.4.11<sup>3</sup>).

न क्षिपरः ॥ ३७ ॥

37. But not when followed by *hi*.

The case excepted is that of *gnī* occurring as nominative singular feminine of *aindrāgnī*: *aindrāgnī hi bārhaspatyā* (v.5.6<sup>2</sup>). The commentator pleads the occurrence of *indragnī havāmahe* “in another text,” as justification of the rule, in saying “by *hi*,” instead of “by *h*.” But we may question whether the justification is not officious and uncalled for.

वीड्दारौकृष्णाश्चरावोयदपरः ॥ ३८ ॥

35. *pati ity asya yatra yatra grutih<sup>1</sup> gravaṇam asti tatra tatra pragrahatvāṁ vijñeyam. yathā: dvāu----: gubh---- grutir iti kim: yam----: priy----. ity ādāv api<sup>2</sup> paddikadece pragrahatvāya<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -tvam.

36. *gnī iti pragraho bhavati<sup>1</sup>. yathā<sup>2</sup>: ant----: vīcav----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

37. *gnī iti sāhniḍhyāl labhyate: na khalu gnī iti<sup>1</sup> padānto hi-parāḥ pragraho bhavati<sup>2</sup>. yathā: aindr---- evampara iti kim: indr---- iti cākhāntare.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *api*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

38. Also an *i* or *e* followed by *vid*, *dvārāu*, *kṛṣṇah*, *carāvah*, and *yadā*.

The quoted passages under this rule have each its counter-example. The first is *dhishñe vidū sati vīdayethām* (i.4.1<sup>2</sup>), a double case; and, to show that *vī* alone would not have been enough, *āpaç ca me vīrudhaç ca me* (iv.7.5<sup>1</sup>). Next, *devī dvārāu mā mā* (iii.2.4<sup>4</sup>), with *dvādaça sam padyante dvādaça* (i.5.7<sup>3</sup>), to prove the need of the *rāu* of *dvārāu*. Again, *yajñāyā "tishṭhamāne kṛṣṇo rūpam kṛtvā* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first word; they also omit the last two words; while B. O. omit *kṛtvā*); and *cātvāle krṣnaviśnām prā "syutī* (vi.1.3<sup>8</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words) justifies the *h* of *kṛṣṇah*. Again, *vivasāntu ye carāvah* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>), with *rāye ca nah svapatyāya deva* (v.5.4<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit *deva*) to show that *ca* alone would not have been enough: to prove that more than *car* or *carā* is needed, the commentator does not attempt. Finally, we have *ajanān nannamīne: yade 'dām tāḥ* (iv.6.2<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *ajanān*). To this is raised the question whether *yutante*, as coming before *yadā* in *grenīcō yatante yadākshishur divyām* (iv.6.7<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the first word), is not also *pragraha*? The answer is an appeal to rule i.50, “in citations of *padas*, a *pada* only is to be understood:” but how we are to know that an integral *pada* is meant to be signified by *yadā*, any more than by *vid*, the commentator does not inform us.

## न ज्ञे अहे नित्यम् ॥३६॥

39. But not *jñē* and *ahne*, under any circumstances.

The passages quoted in illustration of the rule are *varunāya rājñe kṛṣṇah* (v.5.11), and *vanuspatinām enyahne kṛṣṇah* (v.5.15: only G. M. have the first word): these are both exceptions to the preceding rule, and are the immediate occasion of the

38. .... <sup>1</sup>ity evampara<sup>2</sup> ikāra ekāro rā <sup>3</sup>pragruho bhavati<sup>4</sup>.  
*yathā<sup>5</sup>: dhish-....: dākārena<sup>6</sup> kim: āpaç-....: devī-....: rāv iti kim: dvād-....: yaj-....: visargeṇa kim: cāt-....: viv-....: rāva iti kim: rāye-....: aj-.... nanu<sup>8</sup> gre-.... ity atra pragrahatavin kim nā syāt. padagrahañeshu padām gamyeta (i.50) iti<sup>7</sup> vacanān na bhavati<sup>8</sup> 'ti brāhmaṇah..*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. eshu pareshu. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. padāntah. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. G. M. om. \* G. M. *vid* iti. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. atra. <sup>8</sup> W. pravartate; G. M. om.

39. *jñē: ahne: ity<sup>1</sup> etayor antyasvaro nityam pragruho na syāt. yathā: var-....: van-....: vīdādi* (iv.38) *prāptir anyoh. nityaçabdāḥ prāptyantaraprati-bandhakah<sup>2</sup>*. *yathā<sup>3</sup>: yaj-....: gamayato bhavataḥ* (iv.52) *ity adīnī praptih: svā-....: somāyasva* (iv.48) *iti praptih.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *-pratishedh-*; G. M. *prāptyāniśedhāprayojanakah*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

introduction here of this one. But the addition of *nityam*, ‘constantly, in all cases,’ excepts the same words from the action of any other rule: for example, of rules 52 and 48, which would otherwise apply in the passages *yajñe pi kartor iti tāv abrūtām* (ii.6.7<sup>1</sup>) and *svarājñe novāhāu* (v.6.21).

## आकारैकारपूर्वस्तु बहुस्वरस्य ते थे ॥४०॥

40. *Te* and *the*, however, are *pragraha* in a word of more than two syllables, if preceded by *ā* or *e*.

The class of words here aimed at, of course, is composed of second and third persons plural of present and perfect tenses middle of verbs. The commentator quotes several instances: *etasmin vā etāu mrjāte yo vidvishānayoh* (ii.2.6<sup>1-2</sup>: only G. M. have the first three words, and they omit the last word); *sukrā manthindū grhyete* (vi.4.10<sup>1</sup>); *pra prthivyā riricdthe divaś ca* (iv.2.11<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first and the last two words); and *dṛñhanā yam nudethe* (iv.7.15<sup>2</sup>). Then, to justify the requirement of a preceding *ā* or *e*, we have given us *ā vr̄gyate vā etad yajamānah* (iii.3.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word); of a polysyllabic word, *tat pravāte vi shajanti* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>: see under i.48) and *yad ete gr̄hyante* (iii.3.6<sup>1</sup>); the restriction to the endings *te* and *the*, *anucyamāha & sādayati* (ii.2.5<sup>7</sup>, 11<sup>1</sup>).

As to the special significance of *tu*, ‘however,’ in this rule, two of our commentator’s three chief authorities, Vararuci and Māhisheya, are reported by him as at variance. The former maintains that it indicates the cessation of regard had to the words specified in rule 38 as occasions of *pragraha*-quality; the latter, that it prescribes the annulment of continued implication of the exceptions mentioned in rule 39, and of what was there signified by the word *nityam*. Vararuci’s view is declared the better one, and with good reason—unless, indeed, we prefer to ascribe to the word a general change of subject, from mention of individual words to the description of a class.

40. *bahusvarasya padasya sambandhē te iti the iti vā*<sup>1</sup> “*kārapūrva ekārapūrvo vā pragraho bhāvati. yathā: et-----: suk-----: prā-----: dṛñh----- evampūrva iti kim: ā vr̄g-----: trīṇi-----: bahusvarasye ‘ti kim: tat-----: yad-----: tethe iti kim: anuoc----- vīdādi* (iv.38) *nimittasāpekshatānivartakas tu cābda iti vararucipakshah: māhisheyapakshas tu vakshyate: pūrvasūtroktanishedhanityaçabdajñāpitānurvrttim<sup>4</sup> nivārayati ‘ti<sup>5</sup>: tatra’ vararucimatām ruciram. bahavah svarā yasmin tad bahusvarām: tasya. atra svaraçabdopādānāc<sup>6</sup> ca<sup>7</sup> bahuçabdena vyaktibheda vījñeyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -*dhiya*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *cabdak*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *ucyate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*dham nit*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *vār*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *atra*. <sup>8</sup> W. *bahusvaraçabdopādānatā*; B. O. *bahu-svarāpācābdena upādānatā*. <sup>9</sup> W. B. O. om.

The commentator's final remark as to *bahusvarasya* is obscure to me.

## न शायते ॥४१॥

41. But not *gāryātē*.

Namely, in the passage *gāryātē apibah sutasya* (i.4.18: G. M. omit the last word). An exception to the preceding rule, by express mention of the excepted word.

## ते मापातंनमर्नमभिवायुर्गर्भमुपाहस्तुपरः ॥४२॥

42. *Te* is *pragraha* when followed by *mā pātam*, *namah*, *enam abhi*, *vāyuh*, *garbham*, *upa*, *ahas*, and *tu*.

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are: *vām ā rabhe te mā patam ā 'syā* (i.2.2<sup>1-2</sup>: only G. M. have the first three words), with *te mā 'smīn yajñe* (iii.2.4<sup>1</sup>), to show the necessity of including *pātam* in the rule; *punas te: namo 'gnaye 'pratividdhāya* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the last word), with *te na vy 'ajayanta* (v.4.1<sup>1</sup>), to prove that *na* alone would not have been enough; *te enam abhi sam anahyetām* (ii.5.6<sup>5</sup>), with *ta enam bhishayanti brahmaṇah* (ii.8.11<sup>4</sup>: W. omits the last word), to justify the inclusion of *abhi*; *te vāyur vy avāt* (iii.4.3<sup>1</sup>), with *te vācañ striyam* (vi.1.6<sup>5</sup>), to show why the *yuh* of *vāyuh* was needed; *te garbham adadhātām* (iii.4.3<sup>1</sup>), without any counter-example to prove that *ga* would not have answered the purpose; *te upā 'mantrayanta* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>); *te ahordtrayoh* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>); *te tv āva no 'tsrjye ity āhūḥ* (vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words), with *te te dhdmāny ucmasi* (i.3.6<sup>1</sup>), to show that *t* not followed by *u* is not enough to determine the *pragraha* quality. Then, as further counter-examples, we have *te devāḥ* (i.4.10<sup>1</sup> et al.) in proof that *te* is not *pragraha* before other words than those here mentioned; and *bṛhad ukshe namah* (i.4.26), *amushmin loka upa cere* (v.3.7<sup>2</sup>), and *yanti*

41. *gāryātē ity antyasvarah<sup>1</sup> pragraho na<sup>2</sup> bhavati. yathā: gār----- pūrvasūtraprāptī<sup>3</sup> satyām kāñthoktanishedho<sup>4</sup> 'nena<sup>5</sup> vidhīyate.*

<sup>1</sup> B. -yak s-. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -treṣṇa pr-; B. -tre pr-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -ktyā n-. <sup>5</sup> G. M. em.

42. *----- evamparas te iti ḡabdah pragrahah syāt. yathā: vām----- pātam iti kim: te----- punas----- mā iti kim: te----- te e----- abhi 'ti kim: ta----- te v----- yur iti kim: te v----- te ga----- te u----- te ah----- te tv----- ukārena kim: te te----- evampa iti kim: te d----- te iti kim: bṛh----- am----- yanti-----*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. O. ins. te. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

*vā ete savanddye 'hah* (vii.5.6<sup>3</sup>), showing that only *te* is *pragraha* in the situations defined.

These are not all the instances found in the Sāhitā of *te* as *pragraha*; one was disposed of by rule 20 above, and at least one or two others come under the action of other rules of this chapter.

## अनुदातो न नित्यम् ॥४३॥

43. But not when unaccented, under any circumstances.

That is to say, even in such a situation as would bring it otherwise under the preceding rule. The example quoted is *bāhu-bhyām uta te namah* (iv.5.1<sup>1</sup>): if the text contains others, I have failed to notice them. The specification *nityam* has its usual force, as suspending the application of all rules to the contrary, wherever found: for example, that of rule 52, below, in the passage *namas te astu dyudhāya* (iv.5.1<sup>4</sup>).

## एते तनुवौवैसमेवक्षिप्तपदिष्टकपरः ॥४४॥

44. *Ete* is *pragraha* when followed by *tanuvāu*, *vai sam*, *eva*, *hi*, *yajñā*, *pad*, and *ishṭak*.

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are: *tasyādi 'te tanuvāu* (v.7.3<sup>3</sup>); *ete vā sainvatsurasya cakshushī* (ii.5.6<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), with *ete vā idāyādi stanah* (i.7.1<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word) as counter-example, showing that before *vā* not followed by *sam* the word is not *pragraha*; *sa ete eva namasyann upā 'dhavat* (ii.5.6<sup>5</sup>: only G. M. have the first word, and they omit the last two); *ete hi devāndm* (ii.5.6<sup>6</sup>: another case at vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>); *cakshushī vā ete yajñasya* (ii.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.: compare also the nearly identical passage vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>); *yajñasya hi ete pade atho* (v.1.6<sup>3-4</sup>: W. omits the first word); and *yad ete ishṭake upadā-dhdti* (v.3.5<sup>2</sup>). Counter-examples would have been in place to show that, in citing the last three fragments of words, the rule had taken no more than just what was sufficient for its purpose; but

43. *mā pātam ityādiparo 'pi te ity antyasvaro<sup>1</sup> 'nuddito nityam pragraho na bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: bāh----- nityam iti kim: lakṣaṇāntarapraptasyā<sup>3</sup> 'pi pratischedho<sup>3</sup> yathā syāt: na----: gamayato bhavataḥ* (iv.52) *ity ādinā<sup>4</sup> prāptih.*

<sup>1</sup> O. -yah sv-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. nish-. <sup>4</sup> O. G. M. om.; B. antya.

44. <sup>1</sup>----- *ity evampara ete ity antyasvaraḥ<sup>2</sup> padāntaḥ<sup>3</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā: tas----: ete----: sam iti kim: ete----: sa----: ete----: cak----: yaj----: yad----* <sup>4</sup>*evampara iti kim: atha----: ete iti kim: man----: push----: agre----: sapt----.*<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> B. O. ins. ete. <sup>2</sup> O. -yah s-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. om.

they are not furnished. The general counter-examples under this rule, like those under the last but one, proving that only *ete* is *pragraha* before the words specified, and *ete* itself before them only, are given by G. M., but omitted in the other manuscripts: they are *atha katama ete devā iti* (ii.6.9<sup>3</sup>), *manuta evāi 'nam etāni* (v.5.6<sup>1</sup>), *pushkaraparne hy enam upagritam* (v.1.4<sup>4</sup>: MSS. -*cru-tam*), *agre yajñapatim dhatta* (i.1.5<sup>1</sup>), and *saptume pade juhoti* (vi.1.8<sup>1</sup>).

## परश्च द्वयोः ॥ ४५ ॥

45. As also, the letter following the two last mentioned.

The "two" of the rule are *pade* and *ishtak*; and the commentator makes the further obvious specification that the letter following them is *pragraha* only when they themselves follow *ete*, as prescribed in the preceding rule. He quotes the passages referred to: *yajñasya hy ete pade atho* (v.1.6.3-4: W. omits to *pade*, B. O. to *ete*), and *yad ete ishtake upadadhāti* (v.3.5<sup>2</sup>); adding, to show the necessity of the limitation made by him, the counter-examples *saptume pade juhoti* (vi.1.8<sup>1</sup>), and *tasyās te devī 'shṭake* (iv.2.9<sup>2</sup>).

## स्थःपरः ॥ ४६ ॥

46. Also one followed by *sthah*.

There is a natural reason for this rule, *sthah* being a dual verb, and so, apt to be preceded by a dual noun. I have noted near a dozen cases in the text; the one cited in illustration by the commentator is *vishnoḥ ḡnyaptre sthah* (i.2.13<sup>3</sup>). To show that *sthā* instead of *sthah* would not answer, is given *etusminī loke stha yu-shmāṇi te 'nu* (iii.2.5<sup>6</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words, and they omit the last three).

## परश्चोभयोः ॥ ४७ ॥

47. As also, one following them both.

Following, namely, a *sthah* and a preceding *pragraha* word: for example, *gilpe sthas te vām ā rabhe* (i.2.2<sup>1</sup>: but this citation is wanting in G. M.), and *dṛḍhe sthah gīthire sumīt̄* (iii.2.4<sup>3</sup>). A counter-example, of a word following *sthah* only, is *vṛṣhanāu stha urvaçī* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup>).

45. *nimittina upari vartamānayoh padishtakṣubduyoh<sup>1</sup> para<sup>2</sup> īkāra ekāro vā<sup>3</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā: yuj----- yad----- nimittina upari vartamānayor iti kim: sap----- tas-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *dvayoh padishtak ity etayor cakārānvādishtayoh*; G. M. *pat ishtaka ity etayor cakārānvādishtayoh dvayol*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *parata*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *om.*

46. *sthā ity evampara īkāra ekāro vā padāntah pragraho bhavati. yathā: vish----- visargena kim: et-----*

The commentator then proceeds to point out that the difference in phraseology between this rule and the last but one—*dvayoh*, ‘two,’ being used in the one, and *ubhayoh*, ‘both,’ in the other—indicates a difference of meaning. Above, the two affecting causes (*nimitta*) specified in the preceding rule, each along with the word affected by it (*nimittin*), were intended; here, on the other hand, the two aimed at are an affecting and an affected word.

## सोमायस्वैतस्मिन् ॥४८॥

48. Also in the section beginning *somāya sva*.

The section in question is v.6.21: it was necessary to add *sva*, in order to distinguish it from that beginning *somāya pitrmate* (i.8.5). It contains thirteen *pragrahas*, of which the commentator cites several together: *avī dve dhenā bhārumī* (v.6.21<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *bhāumī*): three of these, however, would be disposed of by the three rules next following.

## दे ॥४९॥

49. Also *dve*.

This word, which occurs about forty times in the Tāittiriya text, is, of course, always *pragraha*. The commentator cites two instances: *dvedve sam bharati* (i.6.8<sup>2</sup>), and *yad dve nāgyetūm* (ii.6.3<sup>3</sup>).

## परश्च ॥५०॥

47. *cakārāvādīshtayoh pārvasūtroktanimittanimittinor<sup>1</sup> ubhayoh para ikāra ekāro vā padāntah prugraho bharati. yathā: cīl-----: dr̥dhe----- ubhayor iti kim: vṛsh----- paruṣ ca dvayor* (iv.45) *iti<sup>2</sup> vācyā ubhayor iti cābdānturam<sup>3</sup> arthāntirājñāpakam<sup>4</sup>: nimittisahitayoh<sup>5</sup> pārvasūtroktayor nimittayoh parah prugraho bhavati: paruṣ ca dvayor* (iv.45) *iti sūtrārthaḥ: atra tu<sup>6</sup> sūtre nimittanimittinor<sup>7</sup> ubhayoh parah prugrahah syād iti viçeshād<sup>8</sup> bhedo vijñeyāḥ.<sup>9</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *pārvokta-* <sup>2</sup> B. ins. *kim ca*, O. ins. *ca*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-taruprayogah*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-kah*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-ttas-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-ttinimittayoh*. <sup>8</sup> B. *-shaya*; O. *-sheṇa*; G. M. *vishaya*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *drashṭavyāḥ*.

48. *somāya svarājñe* (v.6.21) *ity asminn unuvāka ikāra ekāro vā padāntah prugraho bhavati. yathā: avī----- ity id. sve<sup>1</sup> iti kim: somāya pitrmate* (i.8.5) *ity atra mā bhūd iti.*

49. *dve ity antyasvarah padāntah<sup>1</sup> sarvatra prugraho bhavati<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>: dve-----: yad-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om.

50. As also, the following word.

The comment instances but one case, a double one: *dve cukle dve krshne mārdhanvatih* (v.3.1<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). Of such the text contains more than a dozen, but they are not worth referring to in detail.

## एकव्यवेतो जपि ॥५१॥

51. Likewise the next but one.

The *api*, ‘likewise,’ in this rule is explained as bringing forward *dee* from the last rule but one; another application of the “principle of the frog’s leap.” The cited examples are *dve hy ete devate* (ii.1.9<sup>3</sup>: but G. M. omit this citation), and *dve vāva devasatre* (vii 4.5<sup>1</sup>). By rule i.48, *devasatre*, though a divisible compound (*pada*-text; *devasatre iti deva-satre*), is reckoned as but a single *pada* for the purposes of this precept: another like case, *dve savane cukravati* (vi.1.6<sup>4</sup>), was expressly quoted as an illustration under the former rule. At vi.6.4<sup>3</sup> (*dve jāye vindute*) is a case where the action of the rule is suspended by a later one, iv.54.

गमयतोभवतोऽनूकारात्परंतनूयदकरोत्कुर्यादिष्ठब्रू-  
तांप्रवर्तास्ताऽस्तम्भीतांवाचयतिबिभृतस्ताश्चिंगायत्रंताभ्या-  
मेवोभाभ्यामवातरंपरं श्रा षष्ठात् ॥५२॥

52. Before, and within six words of, *gamayatah*, *bhavatah* (except when it follows *ii*), *tanū yāt*, *akarot*, *kuryāt* (in *ishti* passages), *abṛūtām*, *pra varta*, *āstām*, *stabhnītām*, *vācayati*, *bibhr̥tas ta*, *agniñ gāyatram*, *tābhȳām eva*, *ubhābhȳām*, and *avāntaram*.

Of the words here specified, some are duals, and so would naturally have other duals, with *pragraha* endings, in their vicinity; in other cases, the collocation is purely accidental.

The *ā* in the rule is declared to be intended this time “inclusively” (*tena saha*, ‘along with the specified limit:’ compare the scholiast to Pāṇini ii.1.13); and the necessity of the specification

---

50. *cakdro dve ity anvādīgati*: *dve ity etasmāt<sup>1</sup> para ikāra ekāro vā padāntah pragraho bhavuit<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>: dve----.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *asmāt*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *syāt*; G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

51. *ekavyaveto<sup>1</sup> pi dve ity etasmāt para ikāra ekāro vā padāntah pragraho bhavati<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>: dve----: dve---- ekena padena<sup>4</sup> vyaveta<sup>5</sup> ekavyaveta<sup>6</sup>. apicabdo dve ity anvādīgati manḍukaplutinydyena.*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *-vahito*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> W. *vyavahita*.

“within six words” is explained as arising from rule i.30, which would limit the meaning of “before” to ‘the word standing next before.’ This involves a misinterpretation of the rule referred to, which was made for quite another purpose (see the note upon it). No such special and technical ground is needed to justify the terms of the present rule, which are of obvious and incontestable propriety.

The commentator’s example for *gamayataḥ* is *te evāi’nam pratiṣṭhām gamayataḥ* (ii.1.4<sup>7</sup>): I have noted no other case. For *bhavataḥ*, he gives *uttardvātī bhavataḥ* (v.4.8<sup>5</sup>); with the counter-example *dīkshante ‘ntanāmānāv rtū bhavataḥ* (vii.4.8<sup>1</sup>); to show the necessity of the restriction imposed by the rule in the case of this word. There are quite a number of other passages where *bhavataḥ* assures the *pragraha*-quality to words in its neighborhood: I have noted ii.2.2<sup>3</sup>; 11<sup>4-5</sup>; 3.2<sup>9</sup>; 3<sup>5</sup>; 4<sup>3-4</sup>; 8<sup>2</sup>; iii.1.7<sup>2</sup>; 9<sup>3</sup>; 5.4<sup>4</sup>; v.4.6<sup>3</sup>; 5.1<sup>2</sup>; vii.1.4<sup>3</sup>; 2.1<sup>3</sup> twice. With regard to the limitation *anukārāt*, the commentator remarks that although simple absence is the primary significance of its negative prefix, yet another meaning is here assumed, in accordance with the requirements of the case: that is to say, “after a not-*ū*” is to be understood as ‘after any letter but *ū*.’ For *tanū yat*, we have *ete vāi mahāyajñasyā ‘nye tanū yat* (ii.2.7<sup>5</sup>: I have found no other case); and, as counter-example, to justify the inclusion of *yat*, *priyataye tvā grhnāmi tanānapatre tvā* (i.2.10<sup>2</sup>: only W. has the last word). For *akarot*, *budhnāvatī agrarati yājyānuvākye akarot* (ii.3.4<sup>3</sup>: another case at ii.2.8<sup>5</sup>). For *kuryāt*, *mānārī reāu dhāyye kuryāt* (ii.2.10<sup>2</sup>: another case at ii.3.3<sup>5</sup>); with the counter-example *agnaye dātre yurōdāçam ashtākapālūm kuryāt* (ii.5.5<sup>2</sup>), to explain the restriction to *ishtī*-passages. The *ishtīs* are defined as being “the three *pruṇas* beginning with the tenth, but excepting their final *amrākas*” (which have before received the designation *yājyā*): that is to say, ii.2.1-11; 3.1-13; 4.1-13. There are other passages besides the one quoted proving the necessity of the restriction in question: thus v.4.7<sup>7</sup>; vii.5.5<sup>1</sup>. For *abrātām* is cited *te ubrātām vāraṁ vrñāvahā* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup>, 6<sup>5</sup>: another case at v.2.3<sup>3</sup>). For *pravartu*, *havirdhūne prāci pravartayeyuh* (iii.1.3<sup>1</sup>); with the counter-

---

52. *gamayataḥ: bhavato ‘nukārāt: akāravyatiriktavaraṇāt param bhavata iti*<sup>1</sup> : *yady apy abhāvo mukhyārthaś tathā ‘pi tad-anyārthaḥ sṛikṛtā lūkshyānusārāt: tanū yat: akarot: kuryād ishtishu: ishtāyo \* daçamādūyas trayah pruṇā uttumānuvākavarjitāḥ: abrātām: ----- ity evampara ā shashthāt padāt pārro vartumānu tksātu ekāro vā pūdāntaḥ pragraho bhāvati<sup>6</sup>. abhīri-dhāv ayam akārah: tena sahe ‘ty abhividhiḥ. yathā: te----: utt----: anukārāt param iti kim: dīksh----: ete----: yod iti kim: pari----: budh----: mān----: ishtishu iti kim: agn----: te----: hav----: varte ‘ti kim: te----: ime----: vāig----: utt----: tē----: te ‘ti kim: manm----: ete----: gāya-*

example *te 'dityāñ sam adhīriyanta tvayā pra jānāme 'ti* (vi.1.5<sup>1</sup>: G. M. end at *pra*), to show why *varta* was added to *pra*. For *astām, ime vāi sahā "stām* (iii.4.3<sup>1</sup>: another case at iv.3.10<sup>2</sup>). For *stabhnītām, vāigvadevāgnimātrute ukthe avyathayanti stabhnītām* (iv.4.2<sup>3</sup>). For *vācayati, uttame aukhunbarī vācayati* (v.1.10<sup>2-3</sup>). For *bibhṛtas ta, te eva yajamānasya reto bibhṛtas tasmāt* (v.6.8<sup>4</sup>); with the counter-example *manmāhe yāvā dīmanvad bibhṛto yāvā* (iv.7.15<sup>3</sup>), to show that *bibhṛtaḥ* alone would not have answered the purpose of the rule. Doubtless the single case is provided for in this rule rather than in 42, above, because there are cases of *ta eva* in the Sanhitā which it would have made trouble to distinguish properly from this one. For *agnīm gāyatram, ete dadhāte ye agnīm gāyutram* (vi.3.5<sup>2</sup>); with the counter-example *sadhashte gnīm purishyam* (iv.1.3<sup>1</sup>), to show that the addition of *gāyatram* was needful. For *tābhyaṁ eva, ete vāi yajñasyā 'rjusāyāni sruति*. *tābhyaṁ eva* (vii.2.1<sup>2</sup>; 3.5<sup>2</sup>, 7<sup>2</sup>, 9<sup>3</sup>; 4.1<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>). With reference to this passage, the commentator raises the difficulty that *ete*, one of the words intended to be determined as *pragraha*, is not within six words of *eva*, one of the two words specified in the rule as conditioning its *pragraha*-character within that distance; but he declares it of no account, since what is within reach of any part of the assigned cause (*nimitta*) is within reach of that cause in its entirety. For, he says, in common life also, a quality belonging to a part is ascribed to the whole which contains that part: for example, people say “Devadatta has an ear-ring,” when it is really his ear that has the ring. Truly a most lucid and convincing illustration! The necessity of the *eva* is proved by the counter-example *apa hañsy agne tābhyaṁ patema* (iv.7.13<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *ubhābhyaṁ, ye dve ahorātre eva te ubhābhyaṁ* (vii.4.4<sup>4</sup>). Finally, for *avāntaram, utsrjye ity āhur ye avāntaram* (vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>); with the counter-example *sām te 'vu te hedāḥ* (ii.5.12<sup>1</sup>), to prove that *ava* would not have been enough alone.

## न ग्रामीवर्चसीमिथुनीमासेलोकेधत्ते ॥५३॥

53. But not *grāmī, varcasī, mithuni, māse, loke, dhatte*.

*trām iti kim: sadh----: ete----: atra padudvayam ekām<sup>8</sup> nimittam ity<sup>9</sup> etepadam<sup>10</sup> uddīgyā "shashṭhaniyanabhaṅguprasaṅga iti cet: <sup>11</sup>nā 'yam bhaṅguprasaṅgaḥ<sup>11</sup>: nimittāikadeśasya shashṭhatwopapatteḥ sakalasyā 'pi nimittasyā<sup>12</sup> shashṭhatvum upapadyate: loke 'py avayavadharmenā 'vayavino 'pi<sup>13</sup> viçeshasiddheḥ: tathā hi: karne kundularin dñdrayantam kundūlī devadatta iti vadanti. eve 'ti kim: apa----: ye----: ut----: antaram iti kim: sām----: a shashṭhad iti kim: para ity uttarāḥ (i.30) iti paribhāshayā 'nantarasyā 'va paratvām syāt: tan mā bhūd iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *padam naño*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -tām. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -kārya. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *nāma*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -karahitā. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> W. B. O. ste. <sup>8</sup> G. M. etan. <sup>9</sup> O. eve 'ty. <sup>10</sup> O. etat p-. <sup>(11)</sup> B. O. māi 'vam pras-; G. M. om. bhaṅga. <sup>12</sup> W. O. -syā 'pi. <sup>13</sup> B. O. G. M. om.

These are words which, occurring within six of those mentioned in the last rule, would be *prayruha* if not thus specially excepted. The commentator quotes the passages in which they occur, as follows: *grāmy eva bhavati gamavati yājyānurākye bhavataḥ* (ii.3.3<sup>5</sup>; another nearly identical case is found at ii.2.11<sup>4</sup>); *brahmaṇarācasya eva bhuvaty ulhayato rukmāv bhavataḥ* (ii.3.2<sup>3</sup>); *atha mithunī bhavataḥ* (vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>); *pūrṇamāse prā'yachit tār abratām* (ii.5.2<sup>3</sup>); *loke pratitishthanto yanti dvāv shudahāv bhavataḥ* (vii.4.11<sup>3</sup>); and *dhatte jyotishmuntāv asmā imāv lokāv bhavataḥ* (ii.6.2<sup>4</sup>).

### अते समानपदे नित्यमवे चावे च ॥५४॥

54. Nor *ate*, in a single word, nor *ave*, under any circumstances.

After paraphrasing the rule, in a way which shows that he regards the specifications “in a single word” and “under any circumstances” as both alike referring to each of the “parts of words” mentioned, the commentator proceeds to cite illustrative passages, as follows: *avu rūndhate tiratrāv ubhito bharotuh* (vii.2.6<sup>3</sup>; 4.1<sup>3</sup>, 2<sup>5</sup>, 3<sup>6</sup>: another nearly identical case is found at vii.4.5<sup>4</sup>); *ubhyāvayite vajram enam abhi pra vartayati* (iii.2.9<sup>1,7</sup>); and *anātatāya dhṛshnavē: ubhābhȳām utu te nūmūḥ* (iv.5.1<sup>4</sup>: B. O. omit the last word, and G. M. the last two). To show the necessity of specifying that *ate* should form part of a single word, he quotes *eva te ubhābhȳām* (vii.4.4<sup>3</sup>). The limitation *nityam*, ‘under any circumstances,’ is explained in the usual manner, as intended to exclude the operation of other rules besides the one (iv.52) here especially aimed at: for the appropriate examples we are referred to the comment upon rule i.59, where they are given in connection with the illustration of another point.

53. ..... eteshr<sup>1</sup> antyasrūro gamayato bhavata ityādiparo 'pi pragraho na bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: grā----: brah----: atha----: pūr----: loke----: dhatte----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. eshv. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

54. nishedham cakrō nrādiçati. ate: are: ity unayoh padāikadeçayor antyasrārah samānapade vartamāno gamayato bhavata ityādipuro 'pi nityam pragraho na bhavati. yathā: ava----: abhy----: anā----: samānupada iti kim: eca----: atra nityaçabdah prāptiyantaraçparihārārthaḥ. udāharañan<sup>3</sup> upabandhas tu decāya (i.59) iti sūtre<sup>4</sup> prasāngād uktam. samānām ea tat pūdām ea samānapadam: tasmin samānupadē<sup>4</sup>.

iti tribhāshyāratne pratiçākhyavivurane  
caturtho 'dhyāyah.

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. iti sodā-. <sup>3</sup> W. sūtreñā. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. .

This finishes the rehearsal of the words with *pragraha*-endings contained in the *Sanhitā*. As to the economy of the method of their rehearsal—whether it would have been possible to state the facts in fewer or briefer rules—I cannot speak with confidence: it would be, certainly, a thankless task to endeavor to recast them in an improved form. Nor can I, without a *pada*-manuscript, or a much more thorough and detailed study of the text, with the aid of a commentary, than it has been in my power to make, judge absolutely the success of the method followed. It appears, however (with exception of the equivocal treatment of the words in *o*, pointed out under rule 7), to be complete: my excerptation of the text has shown me no *pragraha*-endings in *i* and *e* which are not duly taken account of, nor any case of final *i* or *e* not *pragraha* as involved in the general rules of the chapter without being duly excepted by special precept. One or two words whose endings are treated as uncombinable without being *pragraha* are disposed of in another chapter (x.18).

## CHAPTER V.

CONTENTS: 1-2, introductory, relation of *pada* and *samhitā* texts; 3, order of application of rules; 4-8, anomalous insertions of a sibilant and *d*; 9-10, anomalous conversions of *r* and *h*; 11-19, anomalous omissions of *v*, *s*, *h*, *m*, and *yd*; 20-24, treatment of final *n* and *t* before palatal letters; 25-26, before *l*; 27-31, of final *m* before a consonant; 32-33, of final *ñ*, *t*, *n* before sibilants; 34-37, of initial *ç* after consonants; 38-41, of initial *h* after consonants.

### अथ सङ्खितायामेकप्राणभावे ॥ १ ॥

1. The following rules apply in combined text (*samhitā*), within the compass of a single breath.

This is an introductory heading to the main part of the *Prātiśākhya*—the rules for the construction of the euphonically combined text (*samhitā*) from its presupposed material, the *pada*-text, where

1. *uthe 'ty ayam adhikārah: samhitāyām ekaprāṇabhadāva ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttarām yod vakshyāmaḥ. samhitē 'ti ko 'rthah: nānāpadā dasa māndhāna sāmīyogaḥ*<sup>1</sup> (xxiv.3) *iti "sūtreṇo 'ktāḥ" samhitārthah<sup>2</sup>: parāḥ suminikarshāḥ samhitē 'ti vāiyākuraṇāḥ<sup>3</sup> pat̄hanti<sup>4</sup>. ekasamutthāḥ prāṇa ekaprāṇāḥ: tasya bhāvus tadbhāvah<sup>5</sup>: tasmin: ity ātreyamatam. anyathā 'pi samāsāḥ samīgachate: ekaprāṇena bhāvye junyata uccāryata ity ekaprāṇabhadāvāḥ: ekeno 'chvāsenā yāvān uccāryate vedabhāgas tāvān ekaprāṇabhadāva ity arthaḥ: ata evā 'vasāne padavi-*

each word stands separate, as if occurring independently. It is a rule of far-reaching force, applying through many chapters (for an attempt to define precisely how far, see the comment to xxiv.2). The matters treated in the first two chapters—the mode of utterance of elementary sounds, definitions, general explanatory precepts, and the like—were with propriety first disposed of; the separate rehearsal of the *pragraha*-endings, made in chapter iv., is more questionable, but defensible on the ground that those endings exhibit their *pragraha* character also in the *pada*-text, before *iti*: but the exclusion of the vowels irregularly protracted in *samhitā*, as rehearsed in the third chapter, is quite anomalous (see note to iii.1).

The commentator defines *samhitā* by quoting a later rule (xxiv.3), which declares it to be “the union of separate words in euphonic combination;” referring at the same time to the rule of Pāṇini (i.4.109), as the account of it given by “the grammarians.” For *ekaprāṇabhdre* he first gives us Ātreya’s simple paraphrase; but then goes on to explain it more fully, as ‘that which is brought about, generated, uttered, with a single breath; such portion of the Veda, namely, as is uttered by the help of one expiration’—the condition of *pada*, or separated and euphonically independent words, recurring with the pause that follows the expiration. That is to say, if the repeater of the text has to pause to take breath where there is no regular *avasāna*, or pause of inter-punction (such as separates the *pādas* of a verse: its length is taught in rule xxii.13), his last word is thrown out of *sandhi* with the next, and the end of the one and the beginning of the other must assume their *pada* form.

Now is interposed an objection: of what use are the two specifications “in combined text” and “within the compass of a single breath”? the former is enough by itself. To this it is replied: if the latter specification were not made, then no pause after a *pada* would be authorized in the continuous *samhitā* arrangement: and if the other were not made, then that respecting the single breath would apply also to the *padas*; hence doubt would arise as to where any direction to be given would have force: there is, therefore, good reason for the double specification.

*dhiḥ. nanu samhitāyām ity etāvatāi 'vā' 'lām: ekaprāṇabhdva  
iti vā ubhayārambhānena<sup>8</sup> kim. ucyate: ekaprāṇabhdva ity anā-  
rabhyamāne pravṛttasya samhitāvidheḥ paddvasānatvām ne 'sh-  
yate: samhitāyām ity anārabhyamāne tu padeshv apy ekaprāṇa-  
bhāva upapadyata iti<sup>10</sup> vakshyamānam<sup>11</sup> kāryam kva<sup>12</sup> bhavati  
'ti samdehaḥ syāt: tasmād<sup>13</sup> asminn<sup>14</sup> ubhayārambhāne<sup>15</sup> prayo-  
janam asti.*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. -nayoga. <sup>2</sup> G. M. sūtrotka. <sup>3</sup> G. M. samhitā 'ty ar-. <sup>4</sup> W. B. G. vāyyā-. <sup>5</sup> G. M. bhananti. <sup>6</sup> W. om. <sup>7</sup> B. O. om. eva. <sup>8</sup> B. O. -bhēna; G. M. -bhāne. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. <sup>11</sup> B. G. M. -na. <sup>12</sup> B. O. G. M. kutra vā.  
<sup>13</sup> G. M. taddā. <sup>14</sup> G. M. tas-. <sup>15</sup> O. G. M. -bhe; W. B. -bhēna.

## यथायुक्तादिधि: सा प्रकृतिः ॥२॥

2. Separation from the text as combined—that is the fundamental text.

I cannot but believe the intent of this precept to be the same with that of the rule which begins the second chapter of the Rik Pr., *samhitā padaprakṛtiḥ*, ‘the *pada*-text is the foundation of the *samhitā*:’ but such intent is not readily and distinctly deducible either from the rule itself or from its commentary. The latter explains that hereby is taught the *prakṛti*, or proper form, of *samhitā*, the reason being that a later rule (xxiv.5) prescribes as necessary to be understood, among other things, “*prakṛti, vikramu, kramu*.” An arrangement which does not deviate from the *pada*-text as constituted, taken as supreme, that is to be regarded as the fundamental text. By way of illustration is then quoted the whole series of passages falling under the action of rule x.18, below; passages in which the fundamental or *pada* form of certain words is maintained, against the ordinary rules of euphonic combination: they are *svadhā asy urvi cūsi* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>), *dhanavann iva prapā asi* (ii.5.12<sup>4</sup>), *suhasrasya pramā asi* (iv.4.11<sup>5</sup>; G. M. put this citation before the preceding one), *pra budhnīyā īrute* (iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>), *jyā iyūñ sumane* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>), *ā pūshā etu* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>; W. B. O. omit this), and *aminanta evāih* (iii.1.11<sup>5</sup>). No explanation is attempted of the bearing of these examples upon the principle which is laid down in the rule now in hand: we may suppose it to be that, the application of the rules of *sandhi* being denied in the case of these particular words, they remain in *samhitā* in their regular or natural shape as shown in *pada*-text—*prakṛtyā*, as it is elsewhere termed. And in this office of the precept is to be seen the real ground of its statement, rather than in a provision against the requirements of xxiv.5.

The grand difficulty in this exposition lies in its quiet postulation of *avicalitah*, ‘unremoved, not deviating,’ as connective between *vidhiḥ* and *yathāyuktād*. I would sooner recur to the etymologic meaning of *vidhi*, ‘dis-posal, putting apart,’ and empha-

---

2. *prakṛtiḥ samhitāsvarūpam aneno 'cyate: prakṛtir vikramāḥ kramāḥ* (xxiv.5) *iti vijñeyatavavidhāṇāt. yathāyuktād yathāsthitād padapāthāt kāṭasthād avicalito<sup>3</sup> yo vidhiḥ sā prakṛti-samhitā vijñeyā: vidhir vidhānam prakṛtir ity arthāḥ. yathā<sup>4</sup>: svā----: dhan----: sah----: pra----: jyā----: ā pū----: ami----: atra sūtre padāndm paraspardānvayo mahābhāshyava-candē ca<sup>5</sup> vijñeyāḥ: tac ca vacunām tā varṇapratyayāḥ* (ii.7) *ity atra paṭhanti<sup>6</sup>: evam atrā<sup>7</sup> 'pi svāritayor madhye yatra nīcam* (xix.1) *ity ḍḍlū mantavyam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *rījneyatavavidhāt*; B. -*vena vi-*; G. M. *jñeyatvena vi-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*thāvas-*  
<sup>3</sup> G. M. -*cāline*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. -*tih s-*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -*canēna*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om.  
<sup>8</sup> O. G. M. *paṭhitām*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *anyatrā*.

size its prefix *vi* sufficiently to make it take an ablative adjunct, meaning ‘separation from [the state] as combined;’ and I have so translated above, though far from being confident that I have found the true solution of the difficulty. Neither *vidhi* nor its synonym *vidhāna* occurs elsewhere in the text, although both are frequent in the commentary (see Index), usually with the meaning ‘rule, prescription;’ not infrequently also ‘arrangement, disposal.’

The commentator concerns himself finally with the gender of *sād*, which, he says, comes under the rule already once quoted from the Mahābhāshya in explanation of a like case (under ii.7); and he points out further that the same principle applies elsewhere—for example, in xix.1.

### तत्र पूर्वपूर्वं प्रथमम् ॥३॥

3. And here, that which comes first is first taken.

That is to say, in the construction of the *samhitā* text, both the words to be treated and the rules to be applied must be taken up in their order, as they stand in the text and in the Pratiçākhya respectively. A variety of instances are given to illustrate the working of the principle. First, in *bhaksha*: *a* : *ihi* (iii.2.5<sup>1</sup>), the first two words are first combined, according to x.2, and then their result, *bhakshā*, is combined with *ihi*, by x.4, making *bhakshe* “*hi*,” the true reading; whereas, if the second combination had been first made, forming *e* ‘*hi*, this would have coalesced with *bhaksha* into *bhakshai* ‘*hi*—which (though in itself, as may well be claimed, the preferable reading) is unauthorized and incorrect. This exemplifies the application of the rule to the order in which words are to be treated; for its application to the use of rules there are three examples. The first concerns the production of the *samhitā*-reading *shannavatyāi* (vii.2.15) from the *pada*-reading *shat-**navatyāi*: it is accomplished by the successive application of vii.2, which prescribes the conversion of *n* to *ñ* after *shat*, and of viii.2,

---

3. tatra samhitavidhdne pūrvampūrvam padam sūtram ca prathamaṁ kartavyam. yathā: bhaksha : ā : ihi : ity atra dīrghaṁ samāndakshare (x.2) iti dīrghah : <sup>1</sup> bhakshā : ihi : iti sthita ivarnapara ekāram (x.4) ity ekāre kṛte bhakshe ” ‘hī ’ti bhavati: anyathā ‘hī ’ti kṛtvā bhakshācable<sup>2</sup> samdhīyamāne bhakshai ‘hī ’ti sydt: tac cā ’nishtam: pūrvapadakartavyatva etad udāharanam. pūrasūtrakartavyatve ‘pi vadāmah: yathā: shatītrigrāmanishpūrvah (vii.2) iti nakṛasya native kṛta uttamapara uttamāñ savargiyam (viii.2) ity anena<sup>3</sup> takṛasya native kṛte<sup>4</sup> shannavatyā iti bhavati: anyathā ‘ttamapara uttamam (viii.2) iti sūtre prathamam<sup>5</sup> pravṛtte sati<sup>6</sup> shannavatyā iti sydt: tac cā ’nishtam. tathā<sup>7</sup>: vatth<sup>10</sup> svayamabhi- gūrtaye ‘ty atra. tanakārapūrvac ca takārah (v.33):

which changes *t* before *n* to *n̄t̄*: if, on the contrary, the latter rule had been applied first, changing *shat̄* to *shan̄*, the former would no longer have had force at all, and the reading would have stood *shannuvatyāi*. The next case is that in which the words *rāt̄* and *svayamabhiṣūrt̄īya* come together (iii.2.8<sup>1</sup> seven times: G. M. read *rushat̄* for *rāt̄*, doubtless by a clerical error). Here, v.33 requires the insertion of a *t* between the *t̄* and *s*, and this inserted *t* is then, by xiv.12, made *th̄*; so that we are finally to read *rāt̄th̄ svay-*: if the latter conversion were first made, the reading would turn out instead *rāt̄th̄ svay-* (since v.33 would not then apply at all, but to the combination *rāt̄th̄* would be prefixed a *t̄* of duplication, by xiv.1,5: the manuscripts, as usual in such cases, do not give these complicated readings altogether correctly: and W. B. even make the blunder of substituting at last *vat̄ svāhā*, apparently having in mind *-rāt̄ svāhā*, in the same division). Once more, in the passage *imam̄: vi: syāmi* (ii.1.10<sup>2</sup> and iii.5.6<sup>1</sup>), we are first to convert the *s* of *syāmi* to *sh̄* by vi.4, and then to duplicate the *sh̄* by xiv.1, making *vi shshyāmi*: if the duplication were first performed, making *vi ssyāmi*, then, by rule vi.4, we should have to read *vi shsyāmi*. Of the three examples thus given, only the first has to do with the form of the text as given in the manuscripts, since these very sensibly ignore the rules for duplication which make up the bulk of the fourteenth chapter of our treatise.

So far as regards the taking up of words for combination in their natural order, the Rik Pr. (ii.2) and Ath. Pr. (iii.88) have rules of like force with the present one.

### त्रपुभियुपूर्वः शकारश्चपरः ॥८॥

4. After *trapu* and *mithu* is inserted a *ç* before *c*.

---

*prathama uṣmapuro dvitīyam* (xiv.12) *iti sūtradvayam*  
*prasaktum: tatra pārvatrāt̄ ṣanakārapūrvac ca takdrā<sup>11</sup>*  
*ity etad eva prathamān kartavyam<sup>12</sup>: anyathā<sup>13</sup> vatth svayam iti<sup>13</sup>*  
*syāt: tac cū 'nishtam. athavā: imam̄ vi shshyāmi 'ty atro 'pa-*  
*sarganishpūrvo 'nudattē pade* (vi.4): *svarapūrvam vy-*  
*añjanam<sup>14</sup> dvivarṇam vyāñjanaparam<sup>14</sup>* (xiv.1) *iti sūtra-*  
*dvayam<sup>15</sup> prāptam: tatra dvitīyasūtre<sup>16</sup> prathame kārye sati<sup>16 17</sup> vi*  
*shshyāmi<sup>18</sup> 'ti syāt: tan mā bhūd iti shatvam eva prathamān*  
*kartaryam.*

*pūrvampūrvam iti<sup>19</sup> vīpsā sarvathāi<sup>20</sup> 'vam arthaīn samartha-*  
*yati<sup>20</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *tena*. <sup>2</sup> W. -dena na. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om.  
 \* B. O. *sati*. <sup>7</sup> W. O. -ma. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *vashath̄*; B.  
*vata*; O. *vatt̄*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. om. <sup>12</sup> O. M. put before *prathamam*. <sup>13</sup> W. B. *vat̄ svāhe*  
*'ti*; O. *vat̄ svayam iti*; G. M. *vashath̄ svayam iti*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. om. <sup>15</sup> G. M. -*trai*.  
<sup>16</sup> G. M. *prathamān kṛte*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. ins. *imam̄*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *shyāmi*. <sup>19</sup> G. M.  
*vīpsā sarvatrāi 'tad āhā 'yam iti samarthaniyam*; <sup>20</sup> *vīpsā sarvatrāi 'vam artha-*  
*yati*. <sup>21</sup> O. *svaratrāi*.

The passages are *sîsam ca me trapuṣ ca me* (iv.7.5<sup>1</sup>), and *mi-thuṣ carantam upayatī* (iv.7.15<sup>2</sup>): the existing *pada*-text reads *trapu* and *mithu*, as this rule would lead us to expect. But the right of *trapuṣ* to be recognized as an independent word by the side of *trapu* is assured by the derivative adjective *trîpusha*, and the close analogy of *manu*, *manus*, *mînuṣha*.

The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples: one, *vi-bhu ca me prabhu ca me* (iv.7.4<sup>1-2</sup>), to show that not every *u* has a *ç* added before *c*; the other, *asinā mithū kah* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>), to show that the insertion is only made before *c*, after the words specified.

### सुपूर्व चन्द्रपरः ॥५॥

5. As also after *su*, before *candra*.

The example quoted by the commentator is *suçcandra dasma vicpate* (iv.4.4<sup>6</sup>): the word occurs once more, at ii.2.12<sup>7</sup>. The *pada*-text reads *su-candra*. Counter-examples are: *pra candra-mâs tirati dirgham âyuh* (ii.4.14<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words), and *ā mā sucarie bhaja* (i.1.12): their application is obvious.

### संपूर्वः सकारः कुरुपरः ॥६॥

6. After *sam* is inserted *s* before *kuru*.

The commentator's example is *yajamânah sañskurute* (v.6.6<sup>4</sup> and vi.5.5<sup>2</sup>). The *pada*-text reads *sam* : *kurute*. Counter-examples are *purodâgân alâm kurv iti* (vi.3.1<sup>2</sup>: G. M. have a lacuna involving this passage), and *sâṅkriya châvâkasâdmum bhavati* (v.4.12<sup>3</sup>). The text has further *sañskrtya* and *sañskrta*, but (as is also implied in rule xvi.26) they are read in the *pada*-text as in *sunihitâ*, without division, or ejection of the intruded *s*.

### अकुर्व च प्रत्ययात्परः ॥७॥

4. *trupu*: *mithu*: *evampûrvah* çakâra âgamo bhavati *caparah*<sup>1</sup>. *yathâ*: *sîs-*...: *mith-*... *evampûrva* iti *kim*: *vi-*...: *evampara* iti *kim*: *a-*....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *cakârap-*.

5. *cakârah* çakâram anvâdiçati: *supûrvah* çakâra âgamo bhavati *candraparah*. *yathâ*: *sug-*... *evampûrva* iti *kim*: *pra*...: *evampara* iti *kim*: *ā mā-*... *sv ity esha çabdah pûrvo yasmâd usâu supûrvah*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

6. *sam* *ity evampûrvah* çakâra âgamo bhavati *kuruparah*. *yathâ*: *yaj-*... *evampûrva* iti *kini*: *pur-*...: *evampara* iti *kim*<sup>2</sup>: *sam-*... *kurugabdah paro yasmâd asâu kuruparah*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. om.

7. And before *akurva*, after the augment.

The passage is, as quoted by the commentator, *ta ishuñ sam askurvata* (vi.2.3<sup>1</sup>); the *pada*-text reading *sam: akurvata*. The counter-example is *agnihotram vratam akurvata* (iii.2.2<sup>2</sup>). As *pratyaya* occurs nowhere else in the treatise we cannot tell whether it signifies distinctively ‘augment,’ or, as in other of the Prātiçākhyas, ‘affix’ in general. The commentator gives a scholastic explanation of the term, as indicating “that whereby the consonants are added unto, are made distinct.”

### नीचापूर्वी दकार उच्चापरः ॥ ८ ॥

8. After *nīcā* is inserted *d* before *uccā*.

The passage is *madhyān nīcād uccā* (ii.3.14<sup>6</sup>); and the *pada*-text actually reads *nīcā: uccā*. This is a proceeding to which it would be hard to find a parallel in the *pada*-texts of the other Vedas. To write *madhyena* for *madhyāt* just before would be in itself quite as defensible. As counter-examples, we receive *lokam yanty uccāvacā 'hni* (vii.4.3<sup>6</sup>), and *nīcā tam dhakshi* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>).

At the end of the comment is made the remark “the above are cases of insertion” (*āgama*, ‘accession’). The matter of irregular conversions is next taken up.

### असंपूर्वी अमृकारः ॥ ९ ॥

9. After *asam*, *r* becomes *ar*.

The passage in which this anomalous change is made is *grhd-ñām asamartyādi* (iii.3.8<sup>2</sup>), where the *pada*-text has, as the rule implies, *usam-ṛtyādi*. Here, again, we cannot praise the work of the *pada* text-maker. Nor is the rule of unexceptionable form, for the commentator is obliged to specify that the *asam* intended is one not made up of the parts of two words (not *-a sam*); else such passages as *kalyāñi rāpasamrddhā* (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>), and *vah hy esha*

7. *cakārah sampūrvatvam<sup>1</sup> āgamām<sup>2</sup> cā<sup>3</sup> 'nvādiçati. akurva 'ce 'ti<sup>4</sup> grahanē pratyayāt parah sakāra āgamo bhavati sampūrvah. yathā: ta---- pratyayo nāmā 'kāra ucyate: pratiyanta<sup>5</sup> abhivyajyante vyañjanāny anene 'ti pratyayah. sampūrvva iti kim: agn----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -rvam. <sup>2</sup> G. M. sakdrāg-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. ca; O. G. M. iti. <sup>5</sup> B. O. pratydyante; G. M. pratyayante.

8. *nīcīpūrvo dakāra āgamo bhavaty uccāparah. yathā: madh---- evampūrvva iti kim: lok----: evampara iti kim: nīcā----*

*Āgamā etc.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om.

*samṛddhyā* (ii.2.2<sup>1</sup>) would be included. As counter-example, to show that *r*, not a syllable containing *r*, is liable to the specified conversion, is quoted *asamītrṇne hi hanū* (vi.2.11<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *hanū*).

## अवग्रह आशीर्धःसुवरिति रेफं परः सकारः षका- रम् ॥ १० ॥

10. Of *āçīh*, *dhūh*, and *suvah*, when first members of a compound, the *visarjanīya* becomes *r*, and a following *s* becomes *sh*.

The word *avagraha* in this rule is the locative *avagrahe*, says the commentator, and applies to each of the specified words taken separately. He supplies *visarjanīya*, the omission of which, or of some other word answering the same purpose, is rather a serious defect in the rule. The illustrative passages quoted are *ity āçīr-padaya rca* (vi.2.9<sup>4</sup>; the *pada*-text reads *āçīh-padaya*), *dhūrsh-hāv anaçrū* (i.2.8<sup>2</sup>; p. *dhūh-sāhāv*), and *dadhise suvarshām jih-vām agne* (iv.4.4<sup>1</sup>; p. *swāh-sām*: W. B. O. omit the first word of the citation, G. M. the last). The necessity of the specification "when first members of a compound" is shown by the counter-example *ye devā devasuva stha te* (i.8.10<sup>2</sup>: p. *deva-suvaḥ*: G. M. omit the first two words and the last). *Āçīh* shows the same irregular combination also in *anāçirkena* and *sāçirkena* (i.6.10<sup>4</sup>), but these words are not treated as divisible by the *pada*-text. The commentator goes on to point out the rules to which exceptions are established by this one: viii.23 would require *āçīshpadayā*, and ix.2

---

9. *asam ity evampūrva rkāro 'ram vikāram āpadyate. yathā: gr̥h----- tatra' nimittam ekapadastham<sup>2</sup> vijñeyam: anyathā kaly----- vahī-----: ity ddāv api bhavet. rkāra iti kim: asam-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. *atra*. <sup>2</sup> B. *-dasamīstham*.

10. *avagraha iti saptamyantam padam āçīhprabhrtibhih pratyekam abhisambadhyate. āçīh: dhūh: suvah: ity<sup>1</sup> eteshv avagrahesu visarjanīyo repham āpadyate: ebhyāḥ<sup>2</sup> paro yadi sa-kāro<sup>3</sup> vartate tarhi shakāram<sup>4</sup> āpadyate. yathā<sup>5</sup>: ity-----: dhūr-----: dadh----- avagraha iti kim: ye----- kakhapakāra-parah<sup>6</sup> (viii.23) ity anenā<sup>7</sup> "gīshpadaye 'ti prāptam: <sup>8</sup>aghosh a-paras tasya sasthānam ushmānam<sup>9</sup> (ix.2) iti dhūssāhāv<sup>10</sup> suvassām<sup>11</sup> iti ca prāptam<sup>8</sup>: tadubhayabhaṅgāyā 'yam ārambhah. iticabda eshām evdi 'sha vīgesho nā 'nyeshām iti prakāravdei.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *tebh-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. put before *yadi*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *so 'pi shatvam*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. *parah*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> W. om. <sup>9</sup> B. O. om. <sup>10</sup> B. O. *dhūhs-*. <sup>11</sup> B. O. *suvahs-*.

*dhūssādāu* and *suvaśām* (or, as it is customary to write them, *dhūhsādāu* and *suvaḥśdm*: only G. M. are conscientious about giving the double sibilant, as demanded by the Prātiçākhya). The *iti*, he remarks finally, signifies that only the words mentioned, and no others, are intended—that is to say, it has no particular meaning at all. It would be well if he always as frankly acknowledged the insignificance of this word where it occurs in the rules.

### अथ लोपः ॥ ११ ॥

11. Now for cases of omission.

An introductory rule or heading, having force as far as rule 19, below, inclusive.

### इपूर्वी मकारः ॥ १२ ॥

12. A *m* is dropped, when preceded by *īm*.

The passage aimed at is *īm 'andṛā suprayasah* (iv.1.8<sup>2</sup>: p. *īm*: *mandrā*): it is the only one of its kind in the text. The Vājasaneyi-Sanhitā reads in the corresponding passage (xxvii.15) *īm man-drā*. To treat the loss of a *m* here as suffered by the second word instead of the first is most arbitrary and unreasonable. The particle *īm* is reduced to *i* in quite a number of Rik passages, and before other letters than *m*: they are duly noted in the Prātiçākhya (Rik Pr. iv.36). A series of counter-examples is added by our commentator: *īmam me varuna* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>) shows that *m* is not dropped after another *m* in general; *agnim mitram varunam* (ii.1.11<sup>1</sup>), that *m* after short *i* does not exercise the specified effect; *īmkṛtāya svāhe "īmkṛtāya* (vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>), that *īm* elides no other consonant than *m*. The yet farther restriction is applied, that *īm* here is a *padagrahana*, ‘the citation of a complete *pada*;’ for otherwise there would be an elision of a *m* in such cases as *pr̥thivīm mā hiñsih* (iv.2.9<sup>1</sup>): G. M. add the further example *uta gravasā pr̥thivīm mitrasya*, which I am unable to find in the Sanhitā.

### तुनुपूर्व उदात्तयोर्वकारः ॥ १३ ॥

11. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: lopa ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttarām yad vakshyāmaḥ. ayam adhikāras tish-thanty ekayā* (v.19) *ititisūtraparyanto veditavyaḥ.*

12. *makāra īm ity evampūrvo lupyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: īm..... evam-pūrva iti kim: īm am..... dīrghena kim: agn..... īm iti padagrahānam<sup>2</sup>: itarathā<sup>3</sup> pr̥th..... ity ādāu makāro lupyeta<sup>4</sup>. makāra<sup>5</sup> iti kim: īm.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. -*hacarnah*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *anyathā*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*yate*; and add *tac cā nishtā*. <sup>5</sup> W. -*rapara*.

13. A *v* is dropped when preceded by *tu* or *nu*, in case these are accented.

It is when the particle *vâi*, or *vâva*, follows *tu* and *nu* that this anomalous mutilation is made. The commentator quotes *sa tv̄'di yajeta* (ii.6.6<sup>3</sup> and vii.1.3<sup>1</sup>: p. *sah*: *tu* : *vâi*), and *in nv̄'d upastînam ichanti* (i.6.7<sup>3</sup>: p. *it* : *nu* : *vâi*). The same *sandhi* of *tu* and *vâi* is not infrequent elsewhere (the passages are i.7.1<sup>4</sup>, 6<sup>2</sup>: ii.2.4<sup>8</sup>; 5.4<sup>1</sup>: iii.2.9<sup>2</sup>; 3.9<sup>2</sup>; 5.1<sup>3</sup>: v.5.9<sup>4</sup>: vi.4.3<sup>1</sup>: vii.2.10<sup>3</sup>); that of *nu* and *vâi* is comparatively rare (only at i.5.9<sup>6</sup> twice); that of *tu* and *vâva* I have found only once, at vii.5.6<sup>5</sup>. Here, again, it would seem better to regard the final *u* as suffering elision, instead of the initial *v*. The specification “if accented” is explained as intended to exclude such passages as *anu vrtrahatye* (i.6.12<sup>1</sup>; 7.13<sup>1</sup>), where *anu* would fall under this rule by i.52 (even if the *nu* here, like the *im* in the preceding rule, were regarded as a *padagrahanam*). Other counter-examples, of obvious intent, are *idam vâm dsye havih* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>), and *pra tu janayatî'ti* (i.7.2<sup>4</sup>) and *vidusho nu yajñam* (i.3.13<sup>1-2</sup>).

### उत्पूर्वः सकारो व्यञ्जनपरः ॥ १४ ॥

14. A *s* is dropped after *ut*, when a consonant follows.

The commentator’s example is *praty uttabdhyaî sayatrâya* (vi.6.4<sup>6</sup>: p. *ut-stubdhyaî*). This is, so far as I have discovered, the only case in the Sanhitâ from the root *stabh*: similar forms from *sthâ* occur variously (*anuttîdya*, iii.4.10<sup>3</sup>; *upottîdya*, vii.1.6<sup>8</sup>; 5.15<sup>1,2</sup>; *utthâsyam*, vii.1.19<sup>3</sup>; *utthita*, vii.1.19<sup>3</sup>; 2.9<sup>3</sup>; and *utthâna*, vii.2.1<sup>4</sup> thrice). As counter-examples are given *jagatsthâ devâh* (ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>), *utkrañsyate svâhâ* (vii.1.19<sup>3</sup>), and *utsâdena jihvâm* (v.7.11).

This familiar *sandhi* is also the subject of Ath. Pr. ii.18, and Vâj. Pr. iv.95.

### एषस्य इति च ॥ १५ ॥

15. Also *eshali*, *sah*, and *syah*.

13. *tu*: *nu*<sup>1</sup>: *ity evampûrvo vakâro lupyate tayos tunvor udât-tayoh sator iti vibhajya riyogo<sup>2</sup> vijñeyah. yathâ: sa tv*....: *in nv*.... *udâttaylor iti kim: anu*....: *apy akârdî* (i.52) *iti prâptih: evampûrva iti kim: idam*....: *vakâru iti kim*<sup>3</sup>: *pra*....: *vid*.... *tu*<sup>4</sup> *ca nuç ca tunî*<sup>5</sup>: *tâu pûrvâu yasmât sa ta-thoktaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *nû*, as also B. in the rule itself. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *viniy-*. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *tunû*.

14. *vyañjanaparuh sakâra utpûrvo lupyate. yathâ: praty*.... *vyañjanam asmât parum iti vyañjanaparâh. evampûrva iti kim: jag*....: *sakâra iti kim: ut*....: *evampara iti kim: ut*....

Here the *ca*, ‘also,’ is declared to continue the implication of “when a consonant follows” from the preceding rule. The *iti* is added for the sake of clearness; it shows the final *visarjanīya* of *syah*, and attributes it by analogy to each of the other words also. What indicates that this final *visarjanīya* is the letter which is to suffer elision is not so evident. The illustrative examples are *esha te gāyatrūḥ* (iii.1.2<sup>1</sup>), *sa te jānāti* (i.2.14<sup>2-3</sup>: but G. M. substitute *sa tapo tāpyatū*, iii.1.1<sup>1</sup>), and *esha sya vājī* (i.7.8<sup>3</sup>). The counter-example, showing that the omission occurs only before a consonant, is *dama evā 'syā 'sha upa tishthate* (i.5.7<sup>4</sup>), where, if the *h* of *eshah* were lost by this rule, x.5 would require the reading *esho 'pa*.

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Rik Pr. ii.4, Vāj. Pr. iii.15,16, Ath. Pr. ii.57.

**नातः ॥ १६ ॥**

16. But not *asah*.

Namely, in the passage *hṛtsvaso mayobhūn* (iv.2.11<sup>3</sup>; p. *hṛtsu-asah*), which would otherwise fall under the preceding rule for *sah*, by i.52.

**इदिदग्रन्थमानं एनौषधीः परः सः ॥ १७ ॥**

17. And *sah*, when followed by *id u*, *id agne*, *imāṁ nah*, *enā*, *oshadhīḥ*.

These are the cases in the Sanhitā where, after the regular loss of the final of *sah*, its vowel is irregularly combined with the one that follows, against rule x.25. Such cases in the other Vedic texts are treated at Rik Pr. ii.33,34, and Vāj. Pr. iii.14. The commentator quotes the passages affected, as follows: *se 'd u hotā so adhvārāṇ* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>: B. O. omit the last word; G. M. the last two), *se 'd agne astu* (i.2.14<sup>3</sup>), *se 'māṁ no havyadātīm* (iv.6.6<sup>6</sup>), *sāi 'nā 'nikena* (iv.3.13<sup>2</sup> and 6.1<sup>5</sup>) and *sāi 'shadhir anu rudhyase* (iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>, 11<sup>3</sup>). The first two need counter-examples, to show that it not followed by *u* or *agne* does not coalesce with *sa*: they are *sa ij*

---

15. *vyuktivishaya<sup>1</sup> itigābdūḥ pratyekam esha ity ādīn<sup>2</sup> visarjanīyāntān<sup>3</sup> dyotayati: cakāro vyañjanaparatām anvādiçati. eshah: sah: syah: eshu<sup>4</sup> visarjanīyo vyañjanaparo lupyate. yuthā<sup>5</sup>: esha----: sa----: esha---- evampara iti kim: dama*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*tigishta*; O. -*tiviçishṭa*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*nām*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*yāntatān*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *padeshu*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om.

16. *asa ity asmin<sup>1</sup> grahanē visarjanīyo vyañjanaparo na lupyate. hṛt---- apy akārādi* (i.52) *iti prāptera<sup>2</sup> nishedhah<sup>3</sup>*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etas-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*tih*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

*janena* (ii.3.14<sup>3</sup>) and *sa id deveshu gachati* (iv.1.11<sup>1</sup>). The third also wants a counter-example, to prove the need of *nāh* after *imām*: it is found in *sa imām abhy amṛgat* (v.5.2<sup>4</sup>). Finally, to show that only *sah* undergoes the prescribed effect before the words specified in the rule, we have *paro divā para endā* (iv.6.2<sup>2</sup>).

### अवग्रह इत्येकम् ॥ १८ ॥

18. Also *ity ekam*, when *ekam* is the former member of a compound.

The passage aimed at is *pāpīyānt syād ity ekāikān tasya juhuyāt* (v.1.1<sup>2</sup>: but as given by W. O., without the first two words, it is also found again at v.4.5<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *juhuyāt*); and the *pāda*-text actually reads *ekum-ekam*. The case is akin with that which forms the subject of the next rule. Two counter-examples are given, to justify the terms of the rule: they are *ardhukān syād ity ekam agre tha* (vi.2.3<sup>6</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words), and *yad ekamekañ sambharet* (i.6.8<sup>2</sup>).

### तिष्ठल्येकया सपूर्वः ॥ १९ ॥

19. Also *tish'hanty ekayā*, along with the preceding letter.

The commentator quotes the passage: *tish'hanty ekāikuyā stuṭayā* (vii.5.8<sup>4</sup>); the *pāda*-reading is *ekayā-ekayā*. As counter-example, where the same word remains unmutilated, is given *sumā-nāmām karoty ekayāikayo 'tsargam* (vi.1.9<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the first word).

In this rule and the foregoing are noted, but at the same time ignored, the first occurrences of the compound *ekāika*, which (see the St. Petersburg Lexicon) is not very rare in the Çatapaṭha Brāhmaṇa and later.

17. ..... <sup>1</sup> evamparāh saṅkāra<sup>2</sup> ity atra visarjanīyo lupyate. yathā: se 'd----: se 'd----. v<sup>3</sup> agna ity ābhūyām<sup>4</sup> kim: sa ----: sa ----: se ----: na iti kim: <sup>5</sup>sa ----: sāi ----: sāu ----: sa iti kim: paro -----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. O. *sakura*; G. M. *sa*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. *id*; G. M. O. *u*. <sup>4</sup> B. O. *etābhūyām*. <sup>5</sup> A lacuna in B., to near the end of the comment on rule 18.

18. itīgabḍavīṣiṣṭā ekam ity asminn avagrahe makāro lupyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: pāp----- avagraha iti kim: ardh----- itīgabḍavīṣiṣṭā iti kim:<sup>2</sup> yad-----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> End of the lacuna in B.

19. tish'hantīgabḍavīṣiṣṭā ekaye 'ty asmin grahane 'ntyo<sup>1</sup> varṇāḥ sapūrvāḥ pūrvasahito lupyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: tish----- tish'hantī 'ti kim: sam----- pūrveṇa suha vartata iti sapūrvāḥ.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -yasvaro. <sup>2</sup> O. om.

The terms in which the rule is expressed show that, from rule 15 on, the implication has been of a "final" letter as liable to the effect prescribed. We have reason to be surprised that it was not distinctly stated when first made.

## नकारः शकारं चपरः ॥ २० ॥

20. A *n*, when followed by *c*, becomes *ç*.

The commentator's illustrative examples are *ahīñç ca sarrāñ jambhuyan* (iv.5.1<sup>2</sup>), *rtūñç ca tasyu nukshatriyāñ ca* (vii.1.3<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *ca*), and *kurnāñç cā' kurnāñç ca* (i.8.9<sup>3</sup>). The counter-examples, to show that only *n* is so changed, and *n* itself only before *c*, not before other palatal mutes, are *gum̄ ca me* (iv.7.3<sup>1</sup>) and *tāñ chandobhir anu* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup>: G. M. omit *anu*).

The nature of the conversion taught in this rule, and of the kindred ones forming the subject of rules vi.14 and ix.20, as being a historical, not a euphonic process, has been sufficiently explained and illustrated in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.26. At the same place will be found noted the usage of the other Vedic texts as regards the *sandhi* नः: the Atharvan and the Vājasaneyi-Sanhitā make it uniformly, the Rik only occasionally. In the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā it is prevailingly usual: I have noted thirty-nine examples of it, against the eight exceptions mentioned in the next rule.

The definition of the *sandhi*, of course, is not complete without the aid of rules xv.1-3, which teach that, where *n* has been converted into a sibilant, the preceding vowel is nasalized, or has *anusvāra* added to it. A better course, according to our understanding of the history of the phenomenon, would be to teach the insertion of a *s* (or *visarjanīya*) and the change of *n* to *unusvāra* before it: but the makers of the Prātiçākhyas concern themselves much less about the theoretical accuracy than the mechanical aptitude of their rules.

## नायन्नैरयन्नार्धुवन्नन्दुन्धृणीवान्वारुणानेवास्मिन् ॥ २१ ॥

21. But not the *n* of *āyan*, *āirayan*, *ārdhnuvan*, *anañvān*, *ghṛṇīvān*, *vāruṇān*, and *evā' smin*.

The passages are: *lokam āyan eutāsrah* (v.2.3<sup>4</sup>), *yām āirayān*

20. *cukāraparo<sup>1</sup> nukārah çakāram āpadyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: ah----: rt----: kar----: nakāra iti kim: gum----: capara iti kim: tāñ----: cal<sup>3</sup> puro yusmād asdu caparuh.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *caparo*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *cakirah*.

21. ----- *eteshu<sup>1</sup> grahañeshu nakārah çakāram nā "padyate caparo 'pi. yathā<sup>2</sup>: lo----: yām----: loka----: anañ----: ghṛṇ----: vār----: evā----: ere 'ti kim:<sup>3</sup> asm-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. om.

*candramasi* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>), *loka ḍrdhnuwan carund̄ 'smiṇ* (v.5.1<sup>5</sup>: only G. M. have the first word), *anadvān ca me ḫhenūṣ ca me* (iv.7.10<sup>2</sup>), *ghṛṇīvān cetati tmaṇā* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>), *vārunān catushkapālān nīt̄ va-pet* (ii.3.12<sup>1</sup>: only W. has the last two words), and *evā 'smiṇ cak-shur dhattah* (ii.2.9<sup>3-4</sup>; 3.8<sup>2</sup>). *Evā 'smiṇ* is found once more, in a slightly different connection, at ii.3.8<sup>1</sup>: the others occur only in the passages cited. A counter-example, *asmiṇ̄ cd̄ 'mushmeṇ̄ ca* (vii.3.4<sup>1,5</sup>) is given to prove the need of specifying *eva* before *asmin*.

By rule 24, below, the *n* in all these cases is assimilated to the *c*, and should be so written in the text. My own manuscript of the Sanhitā, in fact, follows the authority of the Prātiçākhya, and represents the assimilated nasal in the same manner as an assimilated *m*, except in a single case (*ḍrdhnuwan car-*). The Calcutta edition, however, in the part hitherto published, gives *n c* only once (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>), and everywhere else *n c*.

## तकारश्चकारश्च शचहपरः ॥ २२ ॥

22. A *t*, when followed by *g*, *c*, or *ch*, becomes *c*.

The form assumed by initial *g* after this assimilation is taught in rules 34-37, below.

The commentator's examples are: *tac chāmyoh* (ii.6.10<sup>2,2-3</sup>), *tac cā 'daduh* (vii.1.5<sup>3</sup>), and *tac chandasām chandastvam* (v.6.6<sup>1</sup>). He proceeds to point out that the *g*, *c*, and *ch*, all mentioned in the rule as upon the same footing, are to be understood as original (not the products of previous euphonic processes), that being their chief or primary value: otherwise the mention of *g* at all would be superfluous; since, the *g* being (by v.34) ordered changed to *ch* after a mute, it would be enough for this rule to say "when followed by *c* or *ch*." Moreover, if the later rule were applied, then, after it, the application of the earlier rule would not be suitable (*svarasa*, 'having its own proper flavor;' the word is not used elsewhere), as it would constitute an offense against the third rule of this chapter.

---

22. *gacachaparas takāraç cakāram ḫpadyate. yathā: tac----: tac----: tac----: atra gacachapara iti sāmānyoktānām<sup>1</sup> ni-mittānām<sup>2</sup> prākṛtitivām<sup>3</sup> vijñeyam: mukhyatvāt: tatra<sup>4</sup> prākṛta-vāikṛtayoh prākṛtam<sup>5</sup> mukhyam: anyathā cakāragrahaṇavāiyarthyāt<sup>6</sup>: kuto vāiyarthym: sparçapūrvah̄ çakāraç chakāram* (v.34) *iti gakdrasya chatve kṛte takāraç cakāram cachapara<sup>7</sup> ity etāvatā 'va siddher<sup>8</sup> iti brāmah̄. kiṁ ca: parasūtre pravṛtte sati paçcāt pūrvasūtraprasaranām na svarasam<sup>9</sup>: tatra pūr-vampūrvam prathamam* (v.3) *iti niyamabhaṅgaprasaṅgāt<sup>10</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. B. O. -nyeno 'kt-. <sup>2</sup> W. O. prani-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. prākṛtitv-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -tatvam. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -yāc ca. <sup>7</sup> G. M. B. gacacha-. <sup>8</sup> G. M. sidhir. <sup>9</sup> G. M. bhavati. <sup>10</sup> G. M. nyāyabh-.

## जपरो जकारम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. When followed by *j*, it becomes *ji*.

The cited example is *taj jayānām jayatvam* (iii.4.4): rather superfluously, a counter-example is also given: *tat pravdite* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>).

## नकार एतेषु जकारम् ॥ २४ ॥

24. A *n*, before the same letters, becomes *ñ*.

As *eteshu* is plural, we are obliged, having recourse to that which lies nearest, to regard as implied the letters pointed out in the last two rules as requiring certain changes in those that precede them: that is to say, *ç*, *c*, *ch*, *j*. These are, in fact, the whole class of palatals, since *ñ* never occurs at the beginning of a word, nor, indeed, in any independent position, and since *jh* is found nowhere in any Vedic text. The dental *n*, then, never maintains itself before a palatal, but is assimilated to it. The other treatises teach virtually the same doctrine: see note to Ath. Pr. ii.11.

The commentator's illustrative example for *n* before *ç* (where, to complete the combination, rule 34 below has also to be applied) is *tenāi 'vai 'nāñ chamayati* (iii.4.8<sup>4</sup>). As for *n* before *c*, he points out that the rule applies only to the cases where the *n* does not become *ç* by v.20, as excepted by v.21, and quotes again one of the examples given under the latter rule, *lokam āyāñ catasrah* (v.2.8<sup>4</sup>). Before *ch*, he gives the phrase already quoted as counter-example under v.20, *tāñ chandobhir anu* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup>); and before *j*, *aparūpam dtmarājāyate* (iii.5.7<sup>3</sup>). As general counter-example, finally, he gives *tāñ subdhāñ* (ii.4.1<sup>1</sup>), where *n*, coming before *s*, is treated in a quite different manner.

The occurrence of *n* before *ch*, which does not once happen in the Atharvan, is found not less than nine times in the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā. My own MS. reads every time *nch*, combining the dental nasal with the palatal aspirate. The Calcutta edition, at the only place which it contains as yet, reads *ñch*.

23. *sāmnidhyāt takāra iti labhyate: japaras takāro jakāram dpadyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: taj---- evampara iti kim: tat----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

24. *eteshv iti bahuvacananirdeçāt<sup>1</sup> pratyāsannam evā 'nape-kshyā<sup>2</sup> sūtradvayasthesu paranimitteshu sampratyayah<sup>3</sup>: tasmād eteshv iti: cacachajeshu<sup>4</sup> parata<sup>5</sup> ity arthaḥ: nakāro ñakāram dpadyate. yathā<sup>6</sup>: te----: çatvāpattāñ nishiddho<sup>7</sup> yo nakāraḥ so 'tra caparavena vishayikriyate. lok----: tāñ----: apa---- evampara iti kim: tāñ----*

<sup>1</sup> W. -rdic-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. 'navek-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. praty-. <sup>4</sup> W. O. -chabhu(jeshu). <sup>5</sup> W. para; G. M. pareshv. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. B. O. put after yo.

The combination of final *n* with initial *ŋ*, producing, according to all the phonetic text-books (with trifling exceptions: see note to Ath. Pr. ii.17), *ñch*, is decidedly of more common occurrence. But here, too, my own MS. reads, with but a single exception among the cases which I have noted, *nch*: the Calcutta text is inconsistent with itself, now giving *ñ* (as at ii.2.12<sup>3</sup>), now *n* 'as at i.3.9<sup>1</sup>'.

Final *n* is found yet more frequently before initial *j*, or some scores of times in all. As regards its method of writing the combination, my manuscript is about equally divided between *nj* and *mj*. The Calcutta text is equally wavering; and there is no approach to consistency between the two authorities, or to recognizable principle in either: in both alike, the variation seems wholly accidental and arbitrary.

Such being the case, I think it clear that a careful editor of the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā ought to disregard, as of no authority or consequence, the variations, or the unanimity, of his manuscripts upon all these points, and to adopt uniformly the reading prescribed by the Prātiçākhya (either *ñ* or *m*), wherever a final *n* comes to stand before a palatal mute.

## लपरौ लकारम् ॥ २५ ॥

25. Both *t* and *n*, when followed by *l*, become *l*.

The dual *laparāu* indicates that the *t* and *n*, already treated of, are the letters aimed at in this rule, says the commentator. He cites as examples *yal lohitam parāpatat* (ii.1.7<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), and *triñ lokān ud ajayat* (i.7.11<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have *ud ajayat*). The combination of *n* and *l* is finished by the next rule, and will be further remarked upon in the note thereto.

## नकारो अनुनासिकम् ॥ २६ ॥

26. The *n* becomes nasalized *l*.

As the nasal quality of *n* itself is already established by rule ii.30, explains the commentator, it could not properly be defined here again as nasal. Hence the *anunāsikam* of the present precept must be understood as qualifying the *l* of like position into which the *n* is converted: this *l* is to be a nasal *l*. No additional example is given, the combination having been illustrated under the preceding rule.

There are in the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā over a hundred cases of the meeting of final *n* with initial *l*, and in fully two-thirds of them

---

25. *dvivacanasāmarthyād<sup>1</sup> gṛhitāu prakṛtāu<sup>2</sup> takāranakārāu lakāram āpadyete<sup>3</sup> laparāv. vathā<sup>4</sup>: yal----: triñ----. laḥ<sup>5</sup> paro yābhyañ tāu laparāu.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*hya*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> MSS. -*yate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *lakārah*.

my MS. reads *nl* simply, without attempting any accommodation of the two sounds to one another. In the remaining cases, it treats the *n* in the same way as it would treat a *m*, substituting for it the ordinary *anusvāra*-dot over the preceding *akshara*. The Calcutta text varies between *nl* and *ñll*. Here, as in the cases treated above, there seems to be every reason why an editor should follow one consistent method, as the irregularities of the manuscripts have no ground but accident—and, not less certainly, the method prescribed by the *Prātiçākhyā* is the one better entitled to be followed. As to the way in which the nasal *l* shall be represented, there may be some question. As I have already mentioned (note to ii.30), I cannot think that the designation of the Calcutta edition is at all to be commended, since it properly implies the insertion of an *anusvāra* between the preceding vowel and a doubled *l*, and thus quite distorts the character of the combination—except as this is viewed by Ātreya, as noted in a later rule (v.31). The method followed in my MS., on the other hand, is theoretically unobjectionable, since there is no phonetic difference recognized, or to be recognized, by phonetic theory between the combination of *n* and *l* and that of *m* and *l*: it has only the practical inconvenience of not distinguishing to the eye these two combinations—and this is of very small account, since there can be few if any cases where the least ambiguity would result. If the nasal *l* is to be written separately, it should properly have the *virāma* beneath and the sign of nasality over it. That is to say, one ought always to print either अस्मिल् लोके or अस्मिं लोके, not अस्मिल्लोके.

In romanized text, as the assimilated *m* is represented by *m̄*, so, by an analogous method and for the sake of convenient distinction, the assimilated *n* may be very suitably represented by *ñ̄*; and this is the sign with which I have chosen to write it, both before *l* and before the palatals.

All the *Prātiçākyas* (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.35) agree in converting both *n* and *m* before *l* into a nasal *l*.

## मकारं स्पर्शपरस्तस्य सस्थानमनुनासिकम् ॥ २७ ॥

27. A *m*, when followed by a mute, becomes the nasal of like position with it.

The commentator's examples are *yam kāmayeta* (i.6.10<sup>4</sup> et al.), *ÿam ca me* (iv.7.3<sup>1</sup>), *tam te duçcakshāḥ* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>), and *tam prat-*

---

26. *anusvārottamā<sup>1</sup> anunāsikāh* (ii.30) *iti nakārasyā 'nu-nāsikatve siddhe<sup>2</sup> punar atra<sup>3</sup> 'pi tatkathanam anupapannam: tasmād atra lakṣaṇayā nakāro nāma tatsthāno lakṣra<sup>4</sup> ity ar-thāḥ: asāv<sup>5</sup> anunāsikam bhajate<sup>6</sup>. pūrvoktam evo 'dharanam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *nanu anunāsvādi*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. 'pi. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *nak-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *lakāro*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *bhajeta*.

*nathā* (i.4.9). Of *m* before a lingual he is able to give no example, as such a concurrence is not to be found in the Sanhitā.

### अन्तस्थापरश्च सवणमिनुनासिकम् ॥२८॥

28. Followed by a semivowel, it becomes a nasal of like quality with it.

From the class of semi-vowels is excepted *r*, by the next rule. Examples are given for the others, as follows: *samyattl̄ ḍsan* (i.5.1<sup>1</sup> et al.), *suvargam lokam* (i.5.4<sup>2</sup> et al.), *samvatsarāḥ* (i.5.1<sup>3</sup> et al.: the *pada*-text, like that of the Atharvan, reads *sam-vat-sarāḥ*, while that of the Rik leaves the word undivided). No attempt is made in the manuscripts or the printed text of the Sanhitā to give a special representation to these nasal semi-vowels standing for an assimilated *m*: it is left to be understood that the sign of nasality over the preceding *akshara* stands for a nasal letter of like quality with the following consonant in the case of the semi-vowels, just as in that of the mutes, provided for by the preceding rule. Nor are the manuscripts of the Pratiçākhyā and its commentary any more particular—saving that G. M. usually write, instead of *my*, the combination *yy*, without any sign of the nasality of the first *y*.

Only the Ath. Pr. disagrees with our treatise in its treatment of *m* before the semi-vowels, acknowledging no nasal *y* or *v*, but a *l* alone (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.35).

The commentator explains the word *anundsika*, ‘nasal,’ in the rule, by *anundsikadharma-vicishta*, ‘distinguished by nasal quality,’ but afterward raises a difficulty over it, in terms which imply that he regards it as a noun, ‘a nasal;’ asking, how we are to understand it here as equivalent to *sānundsika*, ‘combined with nasality.’ As it is, in fact, originally and properly an adjective, signifying ‘possessed of nasal quality,’ and is constant-

27. *sparcaparo makāras tasya sparcasya sasthānam anunāsi-kam'* *bhajate*. *yathā<sup>2</sup>*: *yam----: gam----: tam----: tam----* *samānam sthānam yasyā' sādu sasthānah*: *tam<sup>3</sup>*: *sparcāḥ paro yasmād asādu sparcaparah*.

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. om.

28. *cakāro makāram anvāddigati*: *antasthāparo makāras tasyā antasthādyāḥ savarnam sadṛgam anundsikam'* *anundsikadharma-vicishtam'* *bhajate*. *yathā*: *saṁ----: suv----: saṁ----nanv anundsikam* *ity anena sānundsikam'* *kathām labhyate<sup>2</sup>*. *ucyate*: *'nitarām parihārah<sup>3</sup>*: *yato dharmavdcakah' gabdo dhar-minam<sup>4</sup> api<sup>5</sup> kathayati*: *'guklah pato nīlam utpalam ity ādivat'*.

<sup>1</sup> B. O. om. <sup>(2)</sup> W. om.; O. *ity anena sānundsikam'* *kathām upalambhāmahe*; G. M. *sakalam upalambhāmahe yathā*. <sup>(3)</sup> O. om. <sup>(4)</sup> W. *dharmena*. <sup>(5)</sup> W. *avika*; O. *avi*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. *yathā*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *ddi*.

ly so used and applied in the Prâticâkhyâ, the difficulty is worse than hair-splitting; it is a downright perversion. The answer by which it is met is a quibble worthy of being matched with it: "because a word expressing a quality also designates the object possessing that quality; as, for example, when we say 'a white cloth,' 'a blue lotus.'" As if the words "white" and "blue" strictly applied to the color alone, and did not just as properly mean 'of white color,' 'of blue color'!

## न रेफपरः ॥२९॥

29. But not when followed by *r*.

*R* being also a semi-vowel, *m* would be converted into a corresponding nasal before it by the previous rule, but for this special exception. The instances given of the treatment of *m* before *r* are *pra sanrâjyam prathamam adhvardñam* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. have only the first two words), and *sânrâjyadya sukratuh* (i.8.16<sup>1</sup>). They are particularly ill selected, as neither case comes under the action of the preceding rule; they fall, rather, under xiii.4, and are, in fact, the two passages there given as examples of the peculiar treatment of *sam* before *rāj*. We ought to have, instead, such passages as *pratyushtaň rakshah* (i.1.2<sup>1</sup>), *vi vayaň ruhema* (i.1.2<sup>2</sup>)—which, of course, are of exceedingly frequent occurrence in the Sanhitâ.

The omission of *m* before *r*, and the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or the insertion of *anusvâra* after the latter, are taught below, in rules xiii.2, xv.1–3. The written and printed texts are consistent in their recognition of the mode of combination thus prescribed, always setting the proper *anusvâra* sign before *r*, while before *y*, *l*, *v* they write the assimilated *m* just as before the mutes.

## यवकारपरश्चैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥३०॥

30. Nor, according to some teachers, when followed by *y* or *v*.

The authorities referred to, of course, would leave the *m* to be treated before these letters as before *r*, and would acknowledge no

---

29. *antasthâtvâd̄ rephaparasyâ<sup>1</sup> 'pi makârasya tatsavarñdnunâsikaprâptir<sup>2</sup> anena nishidhyate: na khalu rephaparo<sup>3</sup> makârah pûreuktam bhajate. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: pra-....: sâm-..... rephah paro yasmâd̄ asâu rephaparah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *rephasya tatp-* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-kâpattih prâpta*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-pakâro*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *om.*

30. *cakâro nishedhânvâdeçakah<sup>1</sup>: prakrto<sup>2</sup> makâra ekeshâm âcâryâñnam pakshe yakâraparo vâ<sup>3</sup> vakâraparo<sup>4</sup> vâ na savarnam anundsikam bhajate. yathâ<sup>5</sup>: sam- : sam-*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-dkarshakah*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. *prâk-*. <sup>3</sup> B. O. *om.* <sup>4</sup> B. *om.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. *om.*

nasal semi-vowel save *l*. Their opinion is again quoted in connection with the rule respecting the actual treatment of *m* before *r* (xiii.3), and the commentator there calls attention to the fact that the “some teachers” spoken of are the same with those here noticed: who they are, he does not attempt to tell us. The view held by them is the same with that taken by the Atharva Prâticâkhyâ, as pointed out above (see Ath. Pr. ii.35, and the note upon it); but, until we know much more than we do at present of the history and mutual relations of these phonetic treatises, it would be highly venturesome to conclude that the authors of this Prâticâkhyâ had here in mind the other one and its authors.

I find it difficult to discover any good phonetic reason why the assimilation of *m* should not yield a like result before all the semi-vowels, and why, if we are to admit an *anusvâra* at all, it would not find a particularly appropriate place as representing the sound into which *m* might naturally pass before *y*, *r*, *l*, and *v*.

As examples, are repeated *sainvatsarah* and *sainyuttâh* (see under rule 28, above).

### उत्तमलभावात्पूर्वी ज्ञुनासिक इत्यात्रियः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Âtreya holds that, when a nasal mute becomes *l*, the previous vowel is nasalized.

As has been pointed out above, Âtreya’s view of the combination is the one represented accurately by the mode of writing adopted in the Calcutta edition. It is not elsewhere supported in the Prâticâkhyas. Its quotation here seems a little unprepared, or the expression of it given in the rule imperfect, as we have been directed to convert *m* and *n*, not into *l*, but into a nasal *l*. One might think, too, that it would be in better place at the beginning of chapter xv., where certain other differences of opinion on kindred points are rehearsed.

The commentator gives Âtreya the title of *muni*, ‘sage,’ instead of *âcârya*, ‘teacher.’

To illustrate the sage’s style of making the combination, he cites *trîñ lokân* (i.7.11<sup>1</sup>) and *suvargañî lokam* (i.5.4<sup>2</sup> et al.); but not one of the manuscripts of the commentary takes the pains to write the extracts as they should be written, to serve their purpose as illustrations. Finally, he adds the caution that “this rule and the preceding are not approved.”

### उत्पूर्वः ककारः सषकारपरः ॥ ३२ ॥

31. *uttamasya nakârasya makârasyâ<sup>1</sup> vâ labhâvâl lakârûpatteh pârvatasvaro ‘nunâsiko bhavati ’ty âtreyo nâma munir manyate. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: trîñ----: suv----. uttamayor labhâva uttamalabhadvah<sup>3</sup>: tasmât.*

*sûtradvâyam etad anishtam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put before *nak-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

32. After *n* is inserted a *k* before *s* and *sh*.

The commentator's examples are *pratyāñk somo atidṛutah* (i.8.21: but G. M. have instead *sadrñk samāndih*, ii.2.8<sup>6</sup>), and *pratyāñk shadaho bhavati* (vii.4.2<sup>5</sup>: O. G. M. omit *bhavati*). As counter-examples, showing that the insertion is made only under the circumstances specified, he gives *pratyāñ hotāram* (vi.8.1<sup>5</sup>), and *tat savituh* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> et al.) and *tat shodaci* (vi.6.11<sup>1</sup>).

The combinations here treated of are not otherwise than rare in any Vedic text. In the Tāittirīya-Sanhita I have found no other instance of the meeting of *n* and *sh* than the one quoted; of *n* before *s*, besides the two here given, occur two others, at vi.3.1<sup>6</sup> and iv.4.4<sup>7-8</sup>; but, in the latter passage, the division of the section into half-centuries falls between the two letters, as the text is at present written, and prevents the exhibition of the *sandhi*. Neither the Calcutta edition (so far as yet printed) nor my manuscript makes in any of these passages the insertion required by the Prātiśākhya: and it may properly enough be considered a question whether the latter's authority ought to be followed in a matter of this character, any more than in regard to the duplications which form the subject of chapter xiv. Nevertheless, considering the phonetic reasonableness of this particular insertion, and its close analogy with that of *t* between *n* and *s* (see the next rule), I should myself decidedly incline to write *nk s* and *nk sh*. The manuscripts of the commentary, it should be remarked, try to follow the directions of the rule, W. B. O. reading *nkṣ*, and W. O. *nksh* (with the *k* and *sh* united in the usual sign for *ksh*); while G. M. even yield to the requirement of xiv.12, and give us *nkhs* and *nkhsh*. This last is a refinement which no one, probably, would care to see introduced into our printed texts.

As is shown in detail in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.9, the teachings of the Ath. Pr. and Vāj. Pr. are virtually in agreement with those of our own treatise as regards the insertions prescribed in this rule and the next, while the Rik Pr. merely mentions them as enjoined by some authorities.

### ठनकारपूर्वश्च तकारः ॥ ३३ ॥

33. After *t* or *n* is inserted a *t*.

The examples given for these combinations are *vashutt svāhā* (vii.3.12 nine times), and *vidvānt somēna yajate* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>); and, in order not to be without an illustration for the collision of *t* with *sh*, one is dragged in from the *jata*-text: *anuyādjū shatt shad̄ andyādjāv anuyādjāv shat̄* (vi.6.3<sup>8</sup>): to which G. M. even add, from the

32. *sak̄ raparāh<sup>1</sup> shak̄raparo vā kakāra ḍagamo bhavati nā-purvah. yathā: praty----: praty---- evampara iti kim: praty----: evampurva iti kim: tat----: tat----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. vā.

same source, *tānt subdhānt subdhāns tāns tānt subdhān* (ii.4.1<sup>1</sup>). Counter-examples are *shad vā ṛtavuh* (iii.4.8<sup>6</sup>), and *tān rudrā abruvan* (v.5.2<sup>6</sup>).

The final lingual *t* occurs before *s*, according to my notes upon the text, in ten other passages (iii.2.8<sup>1</sup> eight times: iv.4.8<sup>1</sup>; 6.1<sup>4</sup>: v.4.3<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>2</sup>; 5.2<sup>6</sup>: vi.2.3<sup>4</sup>; 6.3<sup>3</sup>: vii.1.5<sup>1</sup>; 4.10<sup>2</sup>); and my MS. does not once employ the intermediate *t*. The manuscripts of our commentary, however, all introduce it; and this time B. abets G. M. in converting it into *th*, by rule xiv.12. The combination is without doubt a very troublesome one, in the demand it makes upon the tip of the tongue: but whether the transition is helped by the intrusion of a *t* is a much more serious question—and one to exercise and gratify the subtlety of a Hindū phonetist. The Ath. Pr. also requires *tts* (ii.8), but the Rik Pr. (iv.6) only notices the mode of *sandhi* as enjoined by certain teachers.

It is indeed true that the strict letter of the rule requires a *t* to be inserted between a *t* and *sh*, as illustrated by the commentator from the *jatā*-text. But it would be wholly preposterous to suppose that the authors of the Prātiçākhya intended to teach any such insertion—which would convert the consonant combination from one wholly natural and easy to one in a high degree harsh and difficult, if not absolutely impossible. They evidently relied on the non-occurrence of *sh* after *t* anywhere in the Sanhitā for the annulling of that part of the rule's prescription—either having no regard to a *jatā*-text, or overlooking the fact that in it the two letters would come in contact.

Twice in the Tāittirīya text we have a final *t* before an initial *sh* (at v.5.2<sup>6</sup>: vii.5.6<sup>3</sup>). Although their collision might seem to call for mediation in somewhat the same manner as that of *t* and *s*, the Prātiçākhya makes no special provision for it, and the manuscript text simply combines the two letters.

The meeting of final *n* with initial *s*, the other case contemplated by the rule, is very frequent (there are sixty instances in the first two *kāndas*: I have not collected them through the whole text). Neither the printed text nor my manuscript is absolutely faithful in inserting the prescribed *t*; yet I have found but six cases in the whole Sanhitā in which the latter omits it; and out of the seven passages in *kāndas* i. and ii. where the former leaves it out, my manuscript confirms the omission in only one. As the requirement of the Prātiçākhya receives so much support from the usage of the scribes, and also accords with the prescriptions of the Ath. Pr. (ii.9) and Vāj. Pr. (iv.14), there can be no question that it ought to be followed by an editor of the Tāittirīya Veda.

33. *cakārah sashakārāv anvādigati: takārapūrvo vā<sup>1</sup> nakāra-pūrvo vā takāra ḍagamo bhavati sashakāraparāḥ. vash-----: vid-----: anū-----: tānt----- evampara iti kim: shad-----: tān-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. om.

## स्पर्शपूर्वः शकारश्कारम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34. A *ç* preceded by a mute becomes *ch*.

The commentator gives only an example of a *ç* converted into *ch* after *t*, the *t* at the same time becoming *c* by rule 22, above: *garac chrdutri* (iv.3.2<sup>2</sup>). He adds a counter-example, *āçuh̄ gīgānah* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>). The occurrence of any other final mute than *t* and *n* (for which an example is given above, under rule 24) before initial *ç* is very rare (excepting *m*, for which see the following rule); and it is properly only after a dental, or after a dental or lingual, that the conversion here prescribed has good phonetic ground—namely, in the coalescence of a *t*-sound and a *sh*-sound into the compound sound of our *ch* in *church* (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.17). There is one case of a preceding *t* (i.3.14<sup>6</sup>), where my MS. reads, as the Prātiçākhyā directs, *t ch*, while the Calcutta text has *t ç*. A single case of preceding *p* is treated of below, in rule 36.

## न मकारपूर्वः ॥ ३५ ॥

35. But not when preceded by *m*.

By this rule, says the commentator, is annulled the conversion of *ç* to *ch* after *m*, which would otherwise be in order (according to the preceding rule), since *m* is a mute. He instances *sañcitam me* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup> and v.1.10<sup>2</sup>) and *sañcrañha* (i.7.2<sup>1</sup>). Being thus specially exempted from the operation of the foregoing rule, this combination, of course, falls under xiii.2 and xv.1-3, and the *m*, as before other spirants, becomes *anusvāra*. An objection is raised against the pertinence of the present precept, on the ground that xiii.2 directs the omission of *m* before a spirant, and that hence there could arise no occasion for any such conversion of *ç* into *ch* as is here contemplated and guarded against. The reply, however, is a very easy one; that, by rule 3 of this chapter, the requirement of the conversion into *ch*, as it is stated earlier, would have to be applied first, and that the result of so doing would be to pro-

---

34. *çakdraç chakdram apadyate sparçapūrvah<sup>1</sup>*. *yathā<sup>2</sup>: ga-*  
*rac----- evampūrva iti kim: āçuh̄----- sparçah pūrvo yas-*  
*mād asāu sparçapūrvah.*

<sup>1</sup> G: M. puts first. <sup>2</sup> W. G. M. om.

35. *makdrapūrvah çakdraç chakdram nā "padyste. yathā:*  
*sañ-----: sañ----- sparçatvān makārasya 'tatpārve<sup>3</sup> çakdare<sup>3</sup>*  
*prōptam chatvam<sup>4</sup> anena nishidhyate. nanv etad anupapannam:*  
*'atha makāralopah<sup>5</sup> (xiii.1): rephoshmaparah (xiii.2) iti*  
*makārasya lopavidhānān nā<sup>6</sup> çakdasya chatvāpattinimittam<sup>7</sup>*  
*astī 'ti. māi 'vam: <sup>8</sup>chatvāpādakam malopāpādakāt pūrvam:*  
*atas<sup>9</sup> tatra pūrvampūrvam prathamam<sup>9</sup> (v.3) iti nyā-*

duce, in the passage already quoted, the reading *samchitam me brahma*; which is wrong.

**पकारपूर्वश्च वाल्मीकिः ॥ ३६ ॥**

36. Nor, according to Vālmīki, when preceded by *p*.

There is but a single case in the Sanhitā of *p* before *g*, namely the one here quoted by the commentator, *anushṭup chāradī* (iv.3.2<sup>2</sup>): so my manuscript reads, according to the requirement of rule 34, above. Vālmīki thinks it would be better to read *anu-shṭup cāradī*—and I, presume we shall have little hesitation in approving his opinion.

**व्यञ्जनपरः पौष्करसादेन पूर्वश्च जकारम् ॥ ३७ ॥**

37. Nor, according to Pāushkarasādi, when followed by a consonant; and a preceding *n*, in that case, does not become *ñ*.

This translation is made in accordance with the commentator's exposition. One might be tempted to understand the last part of the rule otherwise, not regarding the continuance of the negative as implied from the other part; translating 'and a preceding *n* becomes *ñ*;' but, besides the authority of the comment against it, this would be a mere repetitious enactment of the rule already given above (v.24). The inquiry is raised, how we know that *pūrvah*, 'the preceding letter,' means here 'a preceding *n*.' The reply is, because only *n* is liable to conversion into *ñ*, and annulment is only made of that which would, without direction to the contrary, be liable to take place.

The examples given to illustrate this peculiar view of Pāushkarasādi are *ādityān sma grubhiḥ* (v.7.12), and *pāpiyān chreyase* (i.5.7<sup>4</sup>). The edition has *pāpiyān chreyase* in the latter passage, in accordance with the approved rules of the Pratiçākhya; but my MS. seems to have been written by a sectary of Pāushkarasādi at this point (namely, in the margin: a line or two of the context was omitted just here by the original scribe). In the former, I

---

*yena chatvam eva pūrvam<sup>10</sup> kartavyam syat: tathā sati makāra spargas<sup>11</sup> <sup>12</sup>tatpare<sup>13</sup> cakāre chatvam<sup>12</sup> āpanne sam----* iti syat: *tan mā bhūd ity etat sūtram upapannam eva.*

<sup>(1)</sup> B. om., excepting *lokavidhāndān na*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. -*vasya*. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. -*rasya*. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. put before *prāptam*. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(6)</sup> G. M. put before *asti*. <sup>(7)</sup> G. M. -*titavān*. <sup>(8)</sup> G. M. *chatvāpādakasya sūtrasya malopasya ca chatvāpādakasyai* 'va *sapūrvatvat*'. <sup>(9)</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>(10)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(11)</sup> B. -*ga*. <sup>(12)</sup> G. M. *tasye* 'ti makāre *ñakaram*. <sup>(13)</sup> B. *pare*.

38. *cakārah pratischedhārthakah*<sup>1</sup>: *vālmīker mate pakārapūrvah*<sup>2</sup> *cakāraç-chakāram*<sup>3</sup> nū "padyate. yathā: an-----

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. -*dākarshakah*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *papū-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *chatvam*.

find the reading *ādityān chmaçrubhiḥ*, which would satisfy neither side. There is one other case of the collision of *n* with *gr* (at v.6.7<sup>3</sup>), where I find read *n chr.* So also, at v.7.1<sup>3</sup> my MS. has *n chv*; and at vii.3.14, *n chy*. These are the only instances, I believe, which the text affords of the combinations contemplated by the rule.

The commentator, at the end, declares this rule and the preceding not approved, and with reason: the evident intent of the treatise is that the conversion of initial *ç* to *ch* shall take place in all the cases falling under rule 34.

प्रथमपूर्वी द्वितीयतुर्थं तस्य स्थानं प्राक्षिकौपि-  
न्यगौतमपौष्ट्रसादीनाम् ॥३८॥

38. According to Plâkshi, Kâundinya, Gáutama, and Pâushkarasâdi, a *h* preceded by a first mute becomes a fourth mute corresponding with the latter.

The examples of this, the approved and customary combination of an initial *h* with a final surd mute, are, as given by the commentator, *arvāg ghy enam* (vi.3.1<sup>1</sup>), *sarad dhavāgvyasya* (v.8.12<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *avyasya*), and *tad dhiranyam* (v.4.2<sup>3</sup> and vi.1.7<sup>1</sup>). In giving the first two quotations, W. O. G. M. (following a vicious and indefensible mode of combination, which occasionally appears even in carefully written Vedic manuscripts, and has incautiously been admitted into some edited texts) write *ghgh* and *dhdh* instead of *ggh* and *dhh*; and in the latter of them my MS. of the *Sanhitâ* does the same (see the note to xiv.5). As counter-examples, establishing the restrictions imposed by the rule, we have *pratyâñ hotâram* (vi.3.1<sup>5</sup>), *vâk ta ã pyâyatâm* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup>), *vashat te* (ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>); and, in W., *ã tishhipat te* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>), but in all the other MSS. *tat te* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup> et al.).

This is one of several instances in which the Prâticâkhyâ, instead of stating first, categorically, its own doctrine, and then mentioning others at variance with this, puts forward the conflicting views of different authorities, without appearing itself to decide in favor of any one against the rest. The commentator here points out (at the end of the chapter) that the present rule presents the accepted doctrine of the treatise, the three that follow being dis-

---

37. pâushkarasâder mate vyañjanaparaḥ çakdra spârçapûrvo  
 'pi chatvam nā "padyate: çakdrapûrvo nakdraç ca ñakdrâm nā  
 "padyate. yathā: ād----: pâp----. pûrva ity ukte nakdra  
 iti kathâm labhyate. ñakdrâpattir asyâdi 've 'ti brûmah: prasak-  
 tasyâi 'va<sup>2</sup> hi<sup>3</sup> pratishedhât.<sup>4</sup> vyañjanam asmât param iti vy-  
 ayanaparah.

*ndi 'tat sâtradvayam ishtam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. *eva*. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*dhaḥ*.

approved; but this does not satisfy us. We might, to be sure, regard ourselves as justified in assuming that the doctrine of the authors of the work is first stated, with due and respectful mention of the authorities upon whom they especially rely in maintaining it: but such an assumption does not in all cases help us out of the difficulty.

### अविकृत एकेषाम् ॥३६॥

39. According to some authorities, it remains unchanged.

That is to say, the authorities here referred to would read, for example, in one of the passages already quoted (vi.3.3<sup>1</sup>), *arvâkhy enam*.

As the euphonic treatment of *h* as a sonant instead of a surd letter is one of the most perplexing anomalies of the Sanskrit phonetic system, such indications as this of the fluctuating and antagonistic views of the old Hindu phonetists respecting it, and the willingness of some of them to give it the value of a surd in making combinations, are worth a great deal to us.

### चतुर्थी इतरे शैत्यायनादीनाम् ॥४०॥

40. According to Çaitîyâyana and others, a fourth mute is interposed.

These respectable authorities would, if their views are not misrepresented, approve the very strange-looking and hardly defensible reading *arvâkgh hy enam* (so writes W., with the utmost possible explicitness; B. reads *arvâk hya hy*; O. gives *arvâgħ hy*; G. M. have *arvâghy*). The commentator tells us (one would like to know on what authority) that the "others" are Kâuhalîputra, Bharadvâja, Old Kâundinya, and Pâushkarasâdi. All are mentioned elsewhere (see Index) in the text itself.

38. *plâkshiprabhrtinâm mate prathamapûrvo hakâras tasya prathamasya sasthânâm caturtham bhajate. yathā: arv-----: sarad-----: tad----- evampûrva iti kim: prát-----: hakâra iti kim: vâk-----: vâ-----: ā 'ti----- prathamah pûrvo yasmâd asâdu prathamapûrvah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

39. *ekeshâm mate prathamapûrvo hakâro 'vikṛto bhavati. yathā: arv-----.*

40. *çaitîyâyanâdinâm mate hakâraprathamayor antare madhye prathamasthânaç caturthâgamô bhavati. yathā: arv----- adîcâbdena kâuhalîputrabharadvâjasthavirakauñdinya pâushkarasâdayo<sup>1</sup> gr̥hyante.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -ñdinyânam, and then a lacuna to pûjârtham under the next rule.

मीमांसकानां च मीमांसकानां च ॥४१॥

41. As also, according to the Mīmāṃsakas.

The especial mention, in a separate rule, of the agreement of this school with the view of Cāityāyana and his abettors, is made, says the commentary, with an honorific intent.

He adds, as was above remarked, that rules 39 to 41 are disapproved.

## CHAPTER VI.

CONTENTS: 1-5, conversion of *s* and *h* into *sh*; 6-13, exceptions and counter-exceptions; 14, insertion of *s* between final *n* and initial *t*.

अथ षकारश्च सकारविसर्जनीयो ॥१॥

1. Now for conversions of *s* and *visarjanīya* into *sh*.

An introductory heading to the rules of this chapter—excepting the last rule.

स्वानासोदिव्यापोद्यथमुकमूमोप्रोत्रीमहियविपथवय-  
क्ष्यपूर्वः ॥२॥

2. A *s* is converted into *sh* when preceded by *svānāso divi*, *āpo hi*, *ayam u*, *kam u*, *ū*, *mo*, *pro*, *tri*, *mahi*, *dyavi*, *padi*, or a former member of a compound.

The illustrative passages, as given by the commentator, are as follows: *uta svānāso divi shantv agneh* (i.2.14<sup>7</sup>: only O. has *agneh*; B. omits both that and the preceding word): with the

41. *cakdrāḥ pūrvoktavidhim anvādiçati: mīmāṃsakānām ca  
nturāgamamataṁ sammataṁ. pūrvoktam evo 'dharanam.  
mīmāṃsakānām<sup>1</sup> pajārtham pr̄thaksūtrārambhah.*

*nāi 'tat sūtratrayam ishtam.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivāraṇe  
pañcamo 'dhyāyah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. to here.

1. *aṭhe 'ty ayam adhikārah: sakāravisorjanīyau shakāram  
āpadyete ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttarān yad vak-  
shyāmaḥ.*

counter-example *tr̥tīyasyām ito divi soma āśit* (iii.5.7<sup>1</sup>), to show the powerlessness of *divi* to effect the change except after *svānd-sah*. Then *āpo hi shthā mayobhuvaḥ* (iv.1.5<sup>1</sup>; v.6.14<sup>2</sup>; vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>; only G. M. have the last word): the necessity of *āpo* is shown by the counter-example *na hi svah svāñ hinasti* (v.1.7<sup>1</sup>). Next *ayam u shya pra devayuh* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>), and *kam u shvid asya senaya* (ii.6.11<sup>2</sup>): with the counter-example *tad u soma dha* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>), to prove that *u* changes *s* only after *ayam* and *kam*. For *u*, the example is *ūrdhva û shu na útaye* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the first word): the other passages in which it exerts a like influence upon an initial *s* are i.5.11<sup>5</sup>; iii.5.10<sup>1</sup>; iv.6.5<sup>6</sup>; v.1.5<sup>3</sup>; vii.1.18<sup>2</sup>; 4.17<sup>2</sup>. For *mo*, the only passage is the one quoted, *mo shū na indra* (i.8.3). For *pro*, only *pro shv asmāi puroratham* (i.7.13<sup>5</sup>). For *tri*, only *tri shadhasthā* (ii.4.11<sup>2</sup> and iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>). For the three remaining words, also, the text affords only the single examples given by the commentator: *mahi shad dyuman namah* (iii.2.8<sup>2</sup>), *ya upa dyavi shtha* (ii.4.14<sup>5</sup>), and *padi shidam amuñcalā yajatrāh* (iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). To the prescription conveyed in the last item of the rule, which seems to demand that every *s* beginning in *puda*-text the latter member of a compound should be changed to *sh*, rule 7, below, makes the very important general exception “not after a consonant or an *a*-vowel;” it means, then, that *s* is so changed after the *i*, *u*, and *r* vowels and the diphthongs. The commentator illustrates only one or two of the cases in which the conversion would be required: *hañsañ cucishad vasuh* (iy.2.1<sup>5</sup>; p. *cuci-sat*: only G. M. have the first word), *ayā vishtā janayan* (i.7.12<sup>2</sup>; p. *vi-sthāh*: only G. M. have *ayā*), and *goshtomain dviti-yam* (vii.4.11<sup>1</sup>).

I have collected from the Sanhitā all the words coming under the operation of this part of the rule, concerning the initial *s* of the latter member of a compound (just about a hundred in number, and some of them of quite frequent occurrence), but I do not think the list worth the trouble of giving here. So far as regards the Prātiçākhyā and its relation to them, the important point is to determine whether its rules and exceptions precisely cover them—and I have to say that I have not succeeded in discovering any want of exact adaptedness to them. There is a single participle, *anusthita*, whose unaltered *s* is unnoticed and unprovided for in the chapter, but it occurs only as final member of a compound, *vishnu-anusthitaḥ* (ii.4.12<sup>3,4,5</sup>; p. *vishnu-anusthitaḥ*), and so, not being itself separated into its constituents, is exempted from the action of the present rule.

---

2. .... ity evampūrvo 'vagrahapūrvac ca sakārah shukāram  
apadyate. yathā: uta....: svāndsa<sup>1</sup> iti kim: tr̥t....: āpo  
....: āpa iti kim: na....: ayam....: kam....: ayamkam  
iti kim: tad....: ūrdh....: mo....: pro....: tri....:  
mahi....: ya....: padi....: hañs....: ayā....: go....:  
avagrahah pūrvo yasmād asāv avagrahapūrvah.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. svāna.

for *nis, ni shtanihi duritā* (iv.6.6<sup>7</sup>: all the manuscripts of the comment, along with my manuscript of the Sanhitā, read thus, as required by ix.1: compare the similar cases noted under rule 13, below). A number of counter-examples are given, showing the effect of absence of any one of the conditions contained in the rule: they are *sadane sida samudre* (iv.3.1), *brhataḥ carmani syām* (iv.1.5<sup>1</sup>), *vi simat-ḥ surucdh* (iv.2.8<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit this example), and *abhi savand pāhi* (i.4.10,11).

The cases coming under this rule are not so numerous but that it may be worth while to report them. Of verbal forms after *au hi* I have found none; after *abhi*, I have noted *abhi shyāma* (i.4.46<sup>3</sup>), and forms of *abhi shiñedmi* (i.7.10<sup>3</sup> et al.) and *abhi shunomi* (iii.1.8<sup>2</sup>); after *prati*, forms of *prati shthāpaydmi* (i.7.5<sup>2</sup> et al.), and *prati shlobhanti* (ii.2.12<sup>3</sup>); after *pari*, forms of *pari shicye* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup> et al.), and *pari shthāt* (i.7.13<sup>3</sup>); after *vi* (besides that quoted under rule 13, below), *vi shajanti* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>), and forms of *vi shyāmi* (iii.4.11<sup>6</sup>); after *ni* (besides the one under rule 13), *ni shāda* (i.8.16<sup>1</sup> et al.), and forms of *ni shidāmi* (iii.5.11<sup>4</sup> et al.). Such cases as *ni-shādāyati* (v.3.7<sup>2</sup>), where the preposition, losing its accent before the accented verbal form, is combined with the latter in the *pada*-text, belong under rule 2, above. The same is the case with *vyātishajet* (vi.6.4<sup>2</sup> et al.), where the verb has two prepositional prefixes, and is therefore written in combination with them (*vi-ātishajet*), and with altered sibilant. But for this circumstance, we should require a separate and special treatment of the word; for *ati* is by this Prātiçākhyā (i.15) excluded from the list of *upasarga*, 'prepositions,' and so could not by the present rule cause the alteration of an initial *s* of a root. *Anu* is also thus excluded, whence the passage *anu sthana* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>) does not fall under the rule, and the retention of its dental sibilant needs no specific authorization. It is the only case, so far as I have discovered, in which the restriction of the class of prepositions to half its usual number has any bearing upon the objects of this rule.

रासःसप्तेऽग्निर्निर्विदुर्महिःपायुभिर्वेसुमतिर्माकि रोयुरायुरा-  
भिःसधिर्नक्षित्कारपरो नित्यम् ॥५॥

5. Also the *visarjanīya*, when followed by *t*, of *agnih* preceded by *rāsah* or *sapte*, and of *nih, viduh, midhuḥ, pāyubhiḥ*,

4. *svānudattē pude vartamānah sakdra upasargapūrvo nish-pūrvo vā shatvam ḍpadhyate. yathā: agm----: imām----: sām----: yaj----: ni----: etāny<sup>1</sup> upasargapūrvant<sup>2</sup>. nishpūr-vam api: ni sh----. evampūrva iti kim: sad----. brh----: sarvānuddatta iti kim: vi----: abhi----: padātti kim: kālūr-tham: padakāle<sup>3</sup> nudatta ity arthah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. etc. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -rgd. <sup>3</sup> W. -kd a.

*dhish tava* (iv.2.3<sup>2</sup>,11<sup>3</sup>). And for *nakih*, *nakish tam ghnanti* (ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>): *nakish tam* is found also at i.8.22<sup>4</sup>.

The final specification of the rule, *nityam*, ‘under all circumstances,’ is explained as intended to assure the inclusion in the rule of the word *avidushṭardśah* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>), already quoted, which would otherwise be liable to exclusion by the operation of rules 8 and 9, below. The word *viduh* itself, we are told, is all right, because of its specific mention in the text, but a little additional force is needed to bring in *aviduh* as its hanger-on. The explanation is by no means of the most satisfactory character, but I have nothing to suggest in its place. We have already once (see note to iii.8) had a case arising under i.52 treated as demanding a special handling.

## अथ न ॥६॥

### 6. Now for exceptions.

An introductory heading, of force in the rules that follow (through rule 13).

अवर्णव्यञ्जनशकुनिपल्यृतमृत्युमलिम्लुब्रहस्पतिपूर्वः ॥७॥

7. Excepted is a *s* preceded by an *a*-vowel, a consonant, *cakuni*, *patni*, *ṛtu*, *mṛtyu*, *malimlu*, or *bṛhaspati*.

The bearing of the first two items of this rule on those which precede it has been noticed under rule 2. The commentator's examples are, for a preceding *a*-vowel, *antarikshasad dhotā* (i.8.15<sup>2</sup> et al.: only G. M. have the second word) and *ā siñcasva* (i.4.19: but G. M. omit the passage), of which one falls as an exception under rule 2, the other under rule 4; and, for a preceding consonant, *rksame vāi* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>). Then, for the words specified, we have *çakunisādena* (v.7.14), *patnisamīyājānām* (ii.6.10<sup>4</sup>: G. M. read -yādjāḥ, which is found twice in the same division of the same section, but not elsewhere), *ṛtusthās tasya* (v.7.6<sup>6</sup>: the same compound is found at v.5.8<sup>1</sup>), *mṛtyusamīyuta iva* (i.5.9<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *iva*), *nāi*

6. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: ne 'ty etad<sup>1</sup> adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttarām yad vakshyāmah<sup>2</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. *vadayāmah*.

7. *avarṇapārvo ryañjanapārvaraç ca çakuni... bṛhaspati: ity<sup>1</sup> evampārvāç ca<sup>2</sup> sakārah shakāram<sup>3</sup> nō "padyate. yathā: ant----: avagrahapūrvatvāt<sup>4</sup> prāptih: <sup>5</sup>ā siñ----: upasarga-pūrvatvāt prāptih<sup>5</sup>: rk----: çak----: patn----: rtu----: mrt----: nāi----: bṛh----: <sup>6</sup>avagrahapūrvatvād eshām prāptih<sup>6</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *shatvam*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *eshām*. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(6)</sup> G. M. om.; W. adds *sa visrasyah: avagrahapūrvatvāt prāptih*.

would also come under the rule, as being *anudâtta* throughout, and also entitled to the designation *pada*, ‘word,’ equally with completely independent vocables: hence the necessity of providing for their exclusion from its action. The commentator illustrates with a couple of examples: *tâsyâdñ devd' âdhi sañvâsantah* (iii.5.1<sup>1</sup>), and *mûkham yajñâdñâm abhî sañvidâné* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the first word). W. B. O. introduce a third, between the other two, namely *abhî sám agachanté 'ti* (ii.5.3<sup>7</sup>); but, as is shown by the accentuation and division, it does not fall under either the fourth rule or this, and has evidently come in by somebody’s blunder.

It is very possible that the Sanhitâ contains other cases requiring the application of this rule; but if so, they have escaped my notice.

## सवस्थानम् ॥ १० ॥

### 10. Also in *sava* and *sthânam*.

The cited passages are *agnisavaç cityâh* (v.6.1<sup>5</sup>), *anusavanam purodâcân* (vi.5.11<sup>4</sup> and vii.5.6<sup>4</sup>), *savanesavane 'bhi gr̄hñâtti* (vi.4.11<sup>4</sup>; 6.11<sup>3</sup>), *prasavâya sâvitrah* (vi.6.5<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word; and the whole example is a blunder, since there is nowhere a rule requiring the lingualization of the sibilant in *prasavâya*), and *gacha gosthânam* (i.1.9<sup>1.2</sup>).

The word *sthânam* being cited with its special case-ending, the rule would not apply to such forms as *sthânah*, *sthâni*, which in fact occur in the compound *pratishthâna* (e. g. i.7.6<sup>6</sup>: ii.4.4<sup>1</sup>), with their sibilant converted to *sh*. *Sava*, however, having no case-ending, falls under rule i.22, and is employed as “part of a word, in order to the inclusion of a variety of cases,” as the comment duly points out, and as his selected examples illustrate.

## न धिपूर्वे ॥ ११ ॥

### 11. But not when *dhi* precedes.

The examples are *adhishavanam asi* (i.1.5<sup>2</sup>: W. omits this example), *adhishavane jihvâ* (vi.2.11<sup>4</sup>), and *adhishthânam âram-*

10. *sava: sthânam: ity<sup>1</sup> etayoh sakârah shakâram<sup>2</sup> nâ* “pad-yate. save<sup>3</sup> 'ti padâkadeço bahûpâdândrthah<sup>4</sup>. agn----: anus----: sav----: pras----: gacha----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *shatvam*. <sup>3</sup> B. *bahûndân padâdnâm arthaḥ*.

11. *sava: sthânam: ity aiyoh<sup>1</sup> sakâre<sup>2</sup> dhipûrve<sup>3</sup> nishedho na prasarati. yathâ: adh----: adh----: adh----. dhi 'ty ayam varñah<sup>4</sup> pûrvo yasmâd asdû dhipûrvah: tasmin*.

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. *etayoh*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *sakârasya pûrva*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. put first. <sup>4</sup> W. om.

(vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>), as examples of the alteration of *san*. *Sani* would not cover all the cases; and the treatise makes no provision for the citation of a theme ending in *i*, or any other vowel than *a*, as representative of all the forms derived from that theme. For *sabheyah* is quoted *susabheyo ya evam* (vii.1.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *evam*). For *sattvā*, *abhisattvā sahojā* (iv.6.4<sup>2</sup>: all the MSS. read everywhere, in text, commentary, and Sanhitā, *satvā*). And for *sasyā*, *susasyādyā supippalābhyaḥ* (i.2.2<sup>3</sup>).

All these are exceptions under rule 2, being cases of compounds whose second member begins with *s*, after a vowel other than an *a*-vowel. The commentary tries (with much discordance between the different manuscripts: see the various readings below) to claim two of them as exceptions under rule 4; but there is no ground for so doing.

न स्वरस्पर्धास्तरीमसाहस्रसारयिस्फुरतीस्तुब्ध्योति-  
रायुश्चतुःपूर्वस्तो ॥ १३ ॥

13. But not in *svara*, *spardhāḥ*, *starīma*, *sāhasra*, *sārathih*, *sphuranti*, *stuh*, and in *sto* when preceded by *jyotih*, *āyuh*, or *catush*.

Of these words, the first six constitute counter-exceptions under rule 8, which excepted words containing *r* or *r̥* from the conversion of their initial *s* into *sh*. The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows: *amba ni shvara* (i.4.1<sup>2</sup> and vi.4.4<sup>3</sup>); *vi shpārdhāś chandāḥ* (iv.3.12<sup>3</sup>)—these two, it is noted, are cases under rule 4, of unaccented verbal forms after a preposition—*sushtarimād jushdānd* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>); *dvishdhasraṁ cinvita* (v.6.8<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *cinvita*), and *trishdhasro vā asdu lokāḥ* (v.6.8<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit after *vā*)—both forms are, we are made to observe, included in the citation of *sāhasra* by its theme-ending *a*, according to rule i.22: other forms do not occur in the Sanhitā, nor these elsewhere than in the two divisions quoted from—*kānayate sushārathih* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>); and *vishphuranti amitrān* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>).

The next case is a very anomalous one, being the conversion of *s* into *sh* after *a*, contrary to the first specification of rule 7. The phrase is *sashtup chandah* (iv.3.12<sup>2</sup>; p. *sa-stup*). Compare similar cases as noted in Ath. Pr. ii.95.

The combination of *sto* with the three words mentioned, although

---

13. .... *stup*: *ity eteshu sakārah*: *jyotih*: *āyuh*: *catush*:  
*evampārvāc ca<sup>1</sup> sto ity atra sakāra ṛkārarephavati* (vi.8):  
*avarṇavyañjana* (iv.7) <sup>2</sup>*iti co'ktam<sup>2</sup> nishedham nā "padyate:*  
*kim tu shatvām pratipadyate*: *iti pratiprasavārtho 'yam nakā-*  
*rah. yathā: ambā----: vi sh----: upasargapārvatvād anayoh*  
*prāptih: susht----: grahanasya ca<sup>3</sup>* (i.22) *iti vacanād akā-*  
*ragṛhitam 'sāhasragrahanam anekārtham: yathā: dvish----*:

देवात्सवनेपशूस्तकारपरः सकारं प्राकृतो नित्ये प्रा-  
कृतो नित्ये ॥ १४ ॥

14. In *tarhān*, *tasmin*, *lokān*, *vidvān*, *tān*, *trēn*, *yushmān*, *ūrdhvān*, *ambakān*, *ṛtūn*, *açman*, *kṛnvān*, *pitṛn*, *anān*, *kapālān*, *tish'han* when accented on the first syllable, *nemir devān*, and *savane paçūn*, an original *n*, followed by a *t*, becomes *s*, when the *t* is a constant one.

There seems to be no particular reason why this rule is introduced here, instead of anywhere else in the work, as it has no relation with the rest of the contents of the chapter. It is a complete rehearsal of the cases in which the old *s*, with which most Sanskrit words in *n* originally ended, is retained under the protection of a following initial *t*. The combination, of course, is historically identical with that of *n c* into *ñgc*, treated of in the preceding chapter (v.20: see the note upon that rule). The "conversion" of *n* into *s*, as the treatise chooses to state the case, involves, by xv.1-3, the prefixion of *anusvāra* to the sibilant.

The examples quoted by the commentator are as follows. For *tarhān*, *catatarhañs trñhanti* (i.5.7<sup>6</sup> and v.4.7<sup>4</sup>). For *tasmin*, *tasmiñs tvā dadhāmi* (i.6.5<sup>1</sup>; 7.5<sup>1</sup>). For *lokān*, *imān eva lokāñs tīr-tvā* (iii.5.4<sup>3</sup>): there is another case of *lokāñs* at ii.3.6<sup>1</sup>. For *vid-vān*, *ya evāñ vidvāñs tridhātaviyena yajate* (ii.4.11<sup>4</sup>: G. M. stop with -yena: the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā has *pacukāmo* before *yajate*, which W. B. O. have doubtless dropped out by an oversight). For *tān*, *kaksheshv aghāyavas tāñs te dadhāmi jambhayoḥ* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words, and they omit the last one): *tāñs* is also found at ii.4.11<sup>4</sup>; iii.1.9<sup>5</sup>; iv.1.10<sup>2</sup> twice; vi.3.1<sup>4</sup> twice; 4.10<sup>3,4</sup>. For *trēn*, *trēñs treñān anu* (ii.5.10<sup>1</sup>). For *yush-mān*, *yushmāñs te 'nu* (iii.2.5<sup>6</sup>): we find *yushmāñs* again at vii.1.5<sup>2</sup>. For *ūrdhvān*, *yāñ ūrdhvāñs tān upabdimataḥ* (iii.1.9<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first word). For *ambakān*, *tryambakāñs tr̥tyasava-nam akurvata* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *ṛtūn*, *ṛtāñs tanrate kavayah prajñatih* (iv.3.11<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit after *tanvate*). For *açman*, *açmañs te kshut* (iv.6.1<sup>1</sup> and v.4.4<sup>1</sup>). For *kṛnvān*, *punah kṛnvāñs tvā pitaram yuvānam* (iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>: only W. has the last word). For *pitṛn*, *oja iti pitṛñs tantur iti* (v.3.6<sup>1</sup>:

14. .... *ādyudātte tishthangrahane* .... *eshu<sup>1</sup> grahañeshu*  
*prākrto nakārah padasamaye<sup>2</sup> vartamānas takāraparah sakāram*  
*āpadyate. yathā: gat-*....: *tasm-*....: *imān-*....: *ya-*....:  
*kaksh-*....: *trēñs-*....: *yush-*....: *yāñ-*....: *tryam-*....: *ṛt-*  
*----*: *açm-*....: *punah-*....: *oja-*....: *prāñ-*....: *api vikṛ-*  
*tam* (i.51) *iti vacanād etad bhavati: dvād-*....: *tribh-*....:  
*ādyuddāta iti kim: na-*....: *apy akārādi* (i.52) *iti prāptih:*  
*nem-*....: *nemir iti kim: jāt-*....: *mādh-*....: *savāna iti kim:*

and eighty, and presume that I may have overlooked here and there others, so that there would be in all ten times as many instances of the omission as of the insertion. In the Atharva-Veda (see second marginal note to Ath. Pr. ii.26) the condition of things is quite different: while the whole number of collisions is much less (only ninety-five), the sibilant is introduced in considerably more than two-thirds of them (in sixty-seven cases, against twenty-eight). The comparison is of some interest in its bearing upon the question of the relative age of the two texts.

## CHAPTER VII.

CONTENTS: 1-12, cases of the conversion of *n* into *ṇ*; 13-14, of *t* and *th* into *ṭ* and *ṭh*; 15-16, exceptions to the conversion of *n* into *ṇ*.

### अथ नकारो णकारम् ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for conversion of *n* into *ṇ*.

An introductory heading, stating the subject of the chapter (with the exception of rules 13 and 14). We have treated here all the cases with which the Prātiçākhya has properly to deal, as arising in the process of conversion of *pada*-text into *samhitā*: chapter thirteen (rule 6 seq.) takes up the occurrence of *n* in a different way, determining every instance in which that letter is found in the whole Sanhitā.

### षुष्कृधिस्तुवः समिन्द्रास्थूर्युत्वाः पद्मनिष्पूर्वः ॥ २ ॥

2. *N* becomes *n* when preceded by *shu*, *shū*, *kṛdhi suvah*, *sam indra*, *asthūri*, *uru*, *vāh*, *shat*, *tri*, *grāma*, or *nih*.

The commentator's illustrative examples are as follows. For *shu*, *ārdhva* & *shu nah* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup> and v.1.5<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the first word); and, as counter-example, *gr̥hesu nah* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>), where *shu*, not being a complete word, does not (by i.50) lingualize the nasal: but G. M. omit this passage and the accompanying explanation. For *shū*, *mo shū na indra* (i.8.3). The commentator points out

1. *athe* *'ty ayam adhikārah*: *nakāro* *nakāram* *āpadyata* *ity etad adhikṛtam* *veditavyam ita uttaram* *yad vākṣyāmaḥ*.

2. ----- *evampārvo* *nakāro* *nakāram* *āpadyate*. *yathā*<sup>1</sup>: *ārdh-----*: *\*gr̥h-----* *ity atra* *ṇatvām* *na bhavati padagrahaneshv* (i.50) *iti vacandt*<sup>2</sup>: *mo-----*: *susū*<sup>3</sup> *ity etayor yadda shatvām* *na 'sti tadda* *ṇatvanishedhārthanī* *vākṛtagrahanam*: *ya-*

O. omits the first word), and *nirupyamānām abhi mantrayeta* (i.6.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word). A counter-example, showing *hanyāt* without altered *n*, is *na ni hanyān na lohitām kuryāt* (ii.6.10<sup>2</sup>).

## पारीपरिपूर्वः ॥८॥

4. Also after *pārī*, *parī*, *parī*, and *pra*.

The illustrative citations of the commentator are *pārīnahyasye* "ce (vi.2.1<sup>1</sup>), *parī no rudrasya* (iv.5.10<sup>4</sup>), *vīravantam parīnam* (ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>), and *pra no devī sarasvatī* (i.8.22<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word). For *pārī* (p. *pārī-nahyasya*: compare iii.7) there is no other case; nor for *parī* (p. *parī-nasam*: compare iii.7); for *parī*, I find only *parī nayati* (ii.8.4<sup>3</sup> et al.). But for *pra* the examples are quite numerous: we have *pra nah* at i.5.11<sup>4</sup>; 6.4<sup>3</sup>; 7.10<sup>2</sup> twice; ii.5.12<sup>1</sup>; iii.1.11<sup>2</sup>; 3.11<sup>4</sup>; iv.2.6<sup>5</sup>; v.5.7<sup>5</sup>; vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>; *pra nāmāni* at iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>; forms of *pra nayāmi* at i.6.8<sup>1</sup> et al., of *pra nude* at ii.1.3<sup>5</sup> et al.; *pranīndya* at i.3.5; *pranīyamānah* at iv.4.9<sup>1</sup>; *pra nenekti* at vi.2.9<sup>1</sup>; *prāṇi* at ii.5.9<sup>2</sup>, *prāṇītī* at i.4.18 and *su-prāṇīti* (but p. *su-prāṇīti*) at i.5.11<sup>5</sup> et al., *prāṇetar* at iii.5.11<sup>2</sup>, and *prāṇava* at iii.2.9<sup>6</sup>. *Parāṇutti* occurs only in composition (vi.2.3<sup>2</sup>; p. *bhrātr̥vyaparāṇuttydi*).

## अवर्णव्यवेतो ऽपि ॥५॥

5. And that, even when an *a*-vowel intervenes.

The word "even" (*api*) here brings down by implication, according to the commentator, the words in the preceding rule from *parī* on—that is to say, virtually, *parī* and *pra*, for there is no case of *parī* exercising such an effect. The examples for *parī* are *agram pary anyat* (ii.3.4<sup>3</sup>: all but O. omit *agram*): I find besides only *pary anyayan*, at vi.5.7<sup>2</sup>), and *paryāṇyād* "havanīyasya (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>). For *pra*, we have *prāṇyādya svāhā* (vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>; p. *pra-andāya*), and *anu prā 'nyāt prathamām* (v.5.5<sup>2</sup>; p. *pre'ti*: *anyāt*: only O. has *anu*). The occurrence of *prāṇa* is very frequent: of other cases, I have noted only *prā 'nudata* at vi.2.3<sup>2</sup>, and *prā 'nudanta* at vi.4.10<sup>3-4</sup>—where, however, the lingualization of the *n* is suspended in our text, as at present constituted, by the intervention

---

4. .... evampārvo nakāro nākāram āpadyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: pār-  
....: parī....: vīr-....: pra-....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om.

5. *apiçabdhā paryāṇyād* *anvādīgati*<sup>2</sup>: *paryāṇyādipārvo*<sup>3</sup> *nakāro* *avarṇavyaveto* 'pi *nātvam bhajate*<sup>4</sup>. *yathā<sup>5</sup>*: *agram*....: *pary-*  
....: *prāṇ-*....: *anu*.... *avarṇavyaveta iti* 'kim: *parī*....:  
*pra*....

<sup>1</sup> B. *pār-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. -*ādeçakah*. <sup>3</sup> B. *pār-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *āpadyate*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. om.

*suprāyana* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>; p. *su-prāyanāḥ*) and *agnishtomaprāyana* (vii.2.9<sup>1</sup>; p. *agnishtoma-prāyanāḥ*). For *yavena*, *prayavena* *pānca* (iv.3.11<sup>2</sup>; p. *pra-yavena*). *Van*, again, is (by W. alone) declared a part of a word, intended to include many cases: only two are given, *yadi vā tāvat pravaṇam* (ii.4.12<sup>1</sup>), and *āhavani-* *yāt pravaṇaṁ syāt* (vi.2.6<sup>4</sup>), nor have I found any other, except the compound *purastātpravaṇah* (v.3.1<sup>5</sup>; p. *purastāt-pravaṇah*). Finally, we have a couple of counter-examples, showing the necessity of the implication from the preceding rule: they are *asi havyavāhanah* (i.3.3), and *udayancāñ veda* (i.6.11<sup>2</sup>).

### प्रापूर्वश्च ॥७॥

7. As also, when preceded by *prā*.

The “also” (*ca*) of this rule brings forward from the preceding rule only the word last mentioned there, namely *van*. The example is *prdvanebhīḥ sajoshasāḥ* (iv.2.4<sup>5</sup>; p. *pra-vanebhīḥ*: compare iii.5). I have noted no other case.

### इन्द्रोऽयजुःपूर्व एनकेन ॥८॥

8. Also *enam* and *kena*, when preceded respectively by *indrah* and *ayajuh*.

There is nothing in the rule meaning ‘respectively,’ and if *enam* were found anywhere in the text preceded by *ayajuh*, or *kena* by *indrah*, their *n*’s would doubtless require lingualization: yet the evident intent of the precept is as translated. The passages are *indra enam prathamah* (iv.6.7<sup>1</sup>), and *yad ayajushkena kṛiyate* (v.1.2<sup>1</sup>; p. *ayajuh-kena*: G. M. O. omit *yat*). I find no other cases falling under the rule: there are, however, one or two other forms, analogous with the latter of those here contemplated, which we might expect to find treated in the same way, namely *anāgirkena* and *sāgirkena* (i.6.10<sup>4</sup>); but they are written by the *pada*-text without division of *āgirkena*, or restoration in it of the dental *n* (thus: *anāgirkena*, and *sa-āgirkena*).

Counter-examples are added: to show that *enam* and *kena*, when otherwise preceded, retain their dental nasals, *rudra enam bhūtvā* (iii.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and *brahmavādinah kena tad ajāmī ’ti* (vii.4.10<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. end with *kena*); to show that *indrah* does not exercise a lin-

7. *cakārākrṣṭe<sup>1</sup>* *vann iti grahanē nakārah pre ’ty evampūrvō natvam bhajute. yathā<sup>2</sup>: prāv-----.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -*ṣṭha*; O. *cakāro* ‘nvādīṣṭo. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

8. *indrah: ayajuh: pārvayor<sup>1</sup> enam: kena: ity etayor nakāro natvam bhajate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: indra----: yad----: evampūrvā iti kim: rudra----: brah----: <sup>3</sup>enāmkene<sup>4</sup> ’ti kim: indro----<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. *ity evampūrvā*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> W. om. <sup>4</sup> B. *kene*.

*navī rakshohānādū* (i.3.2<sup>2</sup>; G. M. omit the first word), and *vṛtra-hanam purāṇḍaram* (iii.5.11<sup>4</sup> and iv.1.3<sup>3</sup>; p. *vṛtra-hanam*: G. M. omit the last word). For *han*, besides the compounds here quoted, which are found repeatedly in other passages, the Sanhitā affords us also *avīrahanādū* (i.2.8<sup>2</sup>; p. *avīra-hanādū*); for the other two words I know of no additional examples. Counter-examples are given, namely *sāhna evā 'smāi* (vi.6.11<sup>4</sup>; p. *sa-ahne*), and *valagahanādū* (i.3.2<sup>1</sup> et al.).

There is good ground for questioning the correctness of the commentator's interpretation of *ra* in the rule as signifying the letter *r* (*rephā*), and not the syllable *ra*. In none of the examples given are the words specified directly preceded by *r*, and it is not at all in accordance with the usage of the treatise to describe as "having *r* before it" a word preceded by another word containing *r*. All the versions of the comment, however, unite in this interpretation, and it is farther assured by the quotation of the rule above, under i.19, as a case in which *r* is called *ra*, instead of *rephā*. It looks as if G. M. had made a blundering attempt to remedy the difficulty by reading the third word *ahan* instead of *han*, and also by understanding *shāh* to mean 'the letter *sh*' (see the various readings, below), thus parallelizing the two specifications. The attempt, however, is an abortive one, only issuing, if carried out, in a host of new difficulties. I have made the translation of the rule conform to the requirements of the comment, but with much misgiving, having hardly a doubt that the meaning properly is 'when preceded by *ra* or *shāh*'.

## सूपर्वी मध्यान्यनी ॥ १२ ॥

12. Also *mayāni* and *anī*, when preceded by *ru*.

The passages are *dārumayāni pātrāni* (vi.4.7<sup>3</sup>; p. *dāru-maya-ni*: O. omits *pātrāni*; G. M. omit the whole example), and *tve vasāni purvaṇīka hotah* (i.3.14<sup>2-3</sup>; p. *puru-anika*: O. omits the first two words, G. M. the last): *purvaṇīka* is found also at

11. *havānī<sup>1</sup>*: *ahne*: *han<sup>2</sup>*: *eshu<sup>3</sup>* *grahaṇeshu* *nakārō rephapūrvah* 'sha ity<sup>4</sup> *evampūrvō*<sup>5</sup> *vā* *natvam bhajate*. *yathā*: *agnih-*  
---: *gar-----*: *hann<sup>6</sup>* *iti paddikadeço bahāpādānārthah*: *ra-*  
*ksh-----*: *vāish-----*: *vṛtr-----* *evampūrvā* *iti kim*: *sāhna*  
----: *val-*.

<sup>1</sup> W. O. *havani*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ahan*. <sup>3</sup> W. *evāni*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *shakāra*. <sup>5</sup> W. B. *ekamp-*; G. M. *pūrvo*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *ahann*.

12. *mayāni*: *anī<sup>1</sup>*: *ity atra rupūrvō* *nakārō<sup>2</sup>* *natvam bhajate*. *yathā<sup>3</sup>*: 'dārum-----' *tve-----* *evampūrvā* *iti kim*: *anī-----*: *agnaye-----*: *rephagrahaṇena* *kim*: *svan-*.

<sup>1</sup> W. O. *anī*, as also (with T.) in rule; G. M. *anika*, as also in rule. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. put after *atra*. <sup>3</sup> W. G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om.

a chapter where they do not belong, and where they sorely disturb the natural and desirable connection. Considering their near relation to the rules of the preceding chapter, they might better have been added there as an appendix; or else put at the head of chapter vii., before its general *adhikâra*.

Only a single illustrative example is quoted, namely *pary antarikshât* (iii.1.10<sup>2</sup>), where rules 4 and 5 of this chapter combined would require *an* at the beginning of the second word, but for the exception here made.

This precept is an anticipation of one of the items of xiii.15, below, and might properly enough be looked upon as open to the charge of *punarukti*, or unnecessary repetition, which the treatise so carefully shuns, and the commentator not seldom labors hard to remove. It is characteristic of the method of the Taittirîya-Prâticâkhyâ that it does not attempt to state the real *nîmitta* or occasion of the lingual *n* in the words rehearsed here, although it does so, fully and distinctly, in rule xiii.6, where the subject of the occurrence of *n* in the interior of a word is taken up.

नव्यतिनूनंनृत्यत्यन्योऽन्यानि॒न्यान्यतश्चातश्च ॥ १६ ॥

16. Nor in *nahyati*, *nûnam*, *nṛtyanti*, *anyaḥ*, *anyābhîh*, *anyâni*; nor when final.

The *ca* in this rule indicates the continuance of the exception. These words, and a final *n*, are not subject to the rules given in the chapter for the substitution of lingual *n*. The commentator quotes as follows. For *nahyati*, *vâsusâ paryânahyati* (vi.1.11<sup>2</sup>; p. *pari-ânahyati*: O. omits the first word): he notes that the case constitutes an exception to rule 5. For *nûnam*, *pra nûnam pûrnavandhurâh* (i.8.5<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word). For *nṛtyanti*, *pari nṛtyanti* (vii.5.10). For the three cases of *anya*, *prâ 'nyâh cañsati* (vii.5.9<sup>3</sup>), *prâ 'nyâbhîr yachaty anv anyâi mantrayate* (v.1.6<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *pra* in all these three examples, and in this, along with G. M., the last three words; B. omits the last word), and *prâ 'nyâni pâtrâni* (vi.5.11<sup>1,2</sup>): the commentator remarks that all these (since *nahyati*) are cases of exceptions under rule 4. He then proceeds to raise the question why the three complete words

---

15. *vâghâshâddividhîr<sup>1</sup>* anudhikrtatvâd utpannoprudhvâniśi: tasmâd atra<sup>2</sup> nâ 'yan nishedhah<sup>3</sup>: 'kiñ tu<sup>4</sup> prakrito<sup>5</sup> natvaridhîr anena vishayikriyate. takâraparo nakâro natvaiñ nû "padyate. yathâ: pary----: pâripariparîprapârvuh (vii.4): avarnavyaveto 'pi (vii.5) iti etâbhâyâm<sup>6</sup> prâptih.

<sup>1</sup> W. O. *vâghâdi*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *tatra*. <sup>3</sup> B. *vîçeshah*. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. *prâk-*  
<sup>6</sup> W. B. *âdibhâyam*.

16. *nishedhâkarshakaç cakârah*: ----- *eshu<sup>2</sup> grahañeshu na-*  
*kârah padântaç ca<sup>3</sup> natvaiñ nu bhajate<sup>4</sup>. yathâ<sup>5</sup>: v âs----: avar-*  
*navyaveto 'pi (vii.5) iti prâptih: pra----: pari----: prâ*

## उत्तमपरं उत्तमश्च सवर्गीयम् ॥२॥

2. A first mute, followed by a last mute, becomes a last mute of its own series.

The examples selected by the commentator to illustrate this mode of combination are *vāñ ma ñsan* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>), *shannavatyādi svāhā* (vii.2.15), and *tan mahendrasya* (vi.5.5<sup>3</sup>). For the conversion of *p* into *m* he is able to offer no instance, as none occurs in the Sanhitā. As counter-examples, showing that only a nasal causes the conversion, and causes it only in a “first” mute, he brings up *vāk ta ḍ pydyatām* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the last word), and *imām no vācam* (vi.4.7<sup>3</sup>).

All the Pratiçākhyas join in treating this conversion as necessary, not as alternative with conversion into a sonant (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.5).

## तृतीयश्च स्वरघोषवत्परः ॥३॥

3. Followed by a vowel or a sonant consonant, it becomes a third mute.

The examples are *r̥dhag ayād̥ r̥dhag uta* (i.4.44<sup>2</sup>), and *yad̥ vāi hotā* (iii.2.9<sup>1</sup>).

## ककुच्च मकारपरः ॥४॥

4. Also in *kakut*, when *m* follows.

Namely, in the passage *kakudmān pratūrtir vājasatamah* (i.7.7<sup>2</sup>; p. *kakut-mān*: G. M. O. omit the last word). As counter-examples are given *ya unmāddyet* (iii.4.8<sup>4</sup>: G. M. O. omit *yah*), and, according to W. B., *kakut trayastrīṅgah* (vii.2.5<sup>3</sup>); for which G. M. O. substitute *kakuc chandaḥ* (iv.3.12<sup>2</sup>). The commentator

2. *uttamaparāḥ prathamāḥ<sup>1</sup> savargiyam uttamam ḫpadyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: vāñ....: shan....: tan.... evampara iti kim: vāk....: prathama iti kim: imām.... uttamāḥ paro yasmād asdv uttamaparāḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. ins. *ātmanah*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

3. *svaraghoshavatparāḥ<sup>1</sup> prathamāḥ savargiyam trīkyam ḫpadyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: r̥dhag....: yad....: ity ādi. svarāg ca ghoshavantaç ca svaraghoshavantāḥ: te pare yasmād asdrū<sup>3</sup> sa tathoktaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> B. om.; G. M. O. *svaraparo ghoshavatparas*, ca. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

4. *kakud ity asmin grahaṇe 'ntyo varṇo<sup>1</sup> mākāraparāṣṭ<sup>2</sup> cakrākṛṣṭam savargiyam<sup>3</sup> trīkyam ḫpadyate<sup>4</sup> yathā<sup>5</sup>: kakud.....*

## न रेफपरः ॥७॥

7. But not before *r*.

*R*, although a sonant consonant, and therefore included in the preceding rule, requires a different treatment in the final *visarjanīya* before it. What this different treatment is, is pointed out farther on in the chapter (rule 16 seq.). The examples here given are *suvo rohāva* (i.7.9<sup>1</sup>), and *ahorātre* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup> et al.: W. O. add *pārṣve*, but there is no such collocation of words in the *Sanhīta*, and I suspect the word to be a corrupted reading for *prāvīgan*, which follows next at the place referred to).

**क्वारभावार्द्धारबिभरजीगरकरनतर्विवःसुवःपुनरहरहः-  
प्रातर्वस्तःशमितःसवितःसनुतस्तनुतस्तोतर्बीतःपितर्मा-  
तर्यष्टरेष्टर्नेष्टस्वष्टः ॥८॥**

8. *Visarjanīya* becomes *r* in *hvāh*, *abhāh*, *vāh*, *hāh*, *abi-*  
*bhāh*, *ajīgah*, *akah*, *anantah*, *vivāh*, *suvhā*, *punāh*, *ahar-*  
*ahāh*, *prātāh*, *vastāh*, *camitāh*, *savitāh*, *sanutāh*, *stanutāh*,  
*stotāh*, *hotāh*, *pitāh*, *mātāh*, *yashṭāh*, *eshtāh*, *neshtāh*, and  
*tvashṭāh*.

With this rule begins the detail of the cases of an original *r* after *a* and *ā*, which is protected and brought to light by a following sonant letter, being treated in quite a different manner from an original *s*, although both *r* and *s* are represented, as finals, by the indifferent *visarjanīya*. The commentator points out at the end the rules to which these cases constitute exceptions, namely ix.7,9,10. His illustrative examples are as follows. For *hvāh*

7. *rephaparo visarjanīyo repham nā "padyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: suvo*  
*-----: ahor-----: ghoshavattvād rephasya pūrvavidhiprāptih.*  
*rephah paro yasmād asādu rephaparah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

8. <sup>1</sup>----- *eteshu<sup>1</sup> visarjanīyo repham āpadyate svaraghoshavat-*  
*parah<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>: mā-----: yonāv-----: vār-----: mā me-----:*  
*ab-----: osh-----: dev-----: karāvar anudātte pade<sup>4</sup> (viii.9)*  
*iti<sup>5</sup> vakshyati: tendāi 'vāi<sup>6</sup> 'tad<sup>7</sup> api sidhyaty<sup>8</sup> apy akārādi (i.52)*  
*iti vacanāt: iti cet: māi 'vam: anudātte kahcabde tad bhavati:*  
*idam tv anyasvardrtham iti<sup>9</sup>: yathā<sup>10</sup>: arvā-----: <sup>11</sup>ādyudāttas*  
*tv idam<sup>11</sup>. yajñā-----: antar anādyudāttte (viii.10) iti vak-*  
*shyati: tasmād ankārādi ca<sup>12</sup> (i.58) iti vacanāt sidhyati: iti*  
*cet: <sup>13</sup>māi 'vam<sup>14</sup>: anādyudāttte tad bhavati: ādyudāttartha<sup>14</sup>*  
*<sup>15</sup>idam grahaṇam<sup>15</sup>. ca -----: suvar-----: punar-----: ahar-*

ponding passage, iv.1.1). For *suvaḥ*, *suvar asi suvar me yachā* (v.7.6<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word): the numerous passages in which this word occurs it would be quite useless to rehearse. For *punah*, *punar ḍasya sadanam* (iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word): this, too, is of too frequent occurrence to be worth detailed reference. For *aharahah*, *aharaha havirdhānīnd* (ii.5.6<sup>3</sup>): the same repetition of *ahah* is found further at i.5.9<sup>6</sup> twice,<sup>1</sup>; ii.5.6<sup>6</sup>. In connection herewith is made the remark that *ahah* when not at the end of a separable compound is the subject of rule 18, below; but that that rule does not apply to a case like the one here in hand. For *prātaḥ*, *prātar upasadaḥ* (vi.2.3<sup>3</sup>): *prātaḥ* is found also at i.4.7: ii.1.2<sup>5</sup>; 5.6<sup>3</sup>; iii.1.7<sup>1</sup>; 3.8<sup>4</sup>; 4.10<sup>1</sup>; vi.4.2<sup>1</sup>. For *vastah*, *doshā-vastar dhiyā vayam* (i.5.6<sup>2</sup>; p. *doshā-vastah*): also at i.2.14<sup>4</sup>. For *gamitah*, *ṛtañ havish̄ gamitar iti trishatyāḥ* (vi.3.10<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first word, only O. the last). For *savitaḥ*, *deva savitar etat te* (iii.2.7<sup>1</sup>): the word is found also in about a dozen other passages. For *sanutah*, *ārāc cid dveshah sanutar yuyotu* (i.7.13<sup>5</sup>). For *stanutah* we are simply referred to "another text" (*cākhāntara*): but G. M. read *sanutar*, and omit *stanutar* in the rule itself. For *stotah*, *etañ stotar etena* (vii.4.20). For *hotah*, *hotar yavishtha sukrato* (i.2.14<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word): also at i.3.14<sup>3</sup>; 6.2<sup>2</sup>; iv.3.13<sup>2</sup>: v.1.4<sup>5</sup>; vi.3.8<sup>2</sup>; 4.8<sup>3</sup>. For *pitah*, resort is had to the *jāṭa*-reading, since the only passage (iii.3.9<sup>1</sup>) in which the word occurs does not bring to view the *r*: thus, *marutām pitah pitar marutām marutām pitah*. For *mātaḥ*, *prthivi mātar mā mā hiñ-śih* (iii.8.2<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word). For *yashṭah*, *agne yashṭar idam namah* (i.1.12). For *eshtah*, again a *jāṭa*-reading, *aciy' eshtar eshtar aciyā 'cī'* *eshtah* (i.2.11<sup>1</sup>): its treatment before the word which follows it in *sāṁhitā* is the subject of rules 18–22 of this chapter; that of the preceding word, of x.14. For *neshṭah*, once more the *jāṭa* is drawn upon, *neshṭah patnīm patnīm neshṭar neshṭah patnīm* (vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>). For *twashṭah*, finally, *givas twashṭar ihā*" *gahi* (iii.1.11<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word): also at i.3.7<sup>1</sup>, 10<sup>1</sup>; iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>: vi.3.8<sup>2</sup>, 11<sup>2</sup>.

The commentary adds a couple of counter-examples, illustrative of the fact that these words show their *r* only before a vowel or sonant consonant: they are *abibhas tam bhūtāni* (ii.5.1<sup>2</sup>), and *pu-nas te māi 'shām* (iv.7.14<sup>3</sup>).

### करावरनुदाते पदे ॥ ६ ॥

9. Also in *kah* and *āvah*, in an unaccented word.

The cited examples are: *mithuyā kar bhūdgadheyam* (i.3.7<sup>2</sup>), and

9. *kah*: *āvah*: *ity etayor visarjanyah padakāle 'nudātta' pade vartamānah svaraghoshavatparo repham āpadyate. yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *mith----- suruco----- anudātta iti kim: ko-----: 'āvo-----'* *evampara iti kim: adhi-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*ta*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(3)</sup> O. om.

deed, whether *ānantaḥ* was not fairly included in the present rule, since the *antaḥ* part of it, at any rate, is not “accented on the first;” but the treatise chooses to avoid so nice a question of interpretation, and to take the safe side.

### आवृत्परः ॥ ११ ॥

11. Also a *visarjanīya* followed by *āvṛt*.

The quoted examples are *jinvar āvṛt svāhā* and *ugnar āvṛt svāhā* (both ii.4.7<sup>1</sup>: B. has *bhimar* for *ugnar*; O. reads in each case *āvṛth*, according to the requirements of rule xiv.12). Other instances in the same and following divisions of the same section are *bhimar āvṛt*, *tveshar āvṛt*, *grutar āvṛt*, and *bhūtar āvṛt*. The anomalous combination does not occur elsewhere.

### इतिपरो अपि ॥ १२ ॥

12. And likewise when *iti* follows.

The word *api* in this rule, we are told, brings forward the implication of “a *visarjanīya* followed by *āvṛt*.” According to the commentator’s exposition, further, the rule is intended to apply to the *jatā* repetition of *grutah* with its predecessor *iti*: as, *iti grutah grutar iti’ti grutah* (ii.4.7<sup>2</sup>). Nor do I see of what other interpretation it is capable, although it seems strange that the irregular conversion of *h* into *r* should be retained in the *jatā*-reading of this word only, and not of the others, where repeated with their respective predecessors. It is clearly implied that we are to read, for example, in the first case falling under the preceding rule, *varshan jinvo jinvo varshan varshan jinval*.

As counter-example, showing the necessity of the implication signified by *api*, we receive *rtubhir havanagrutah* (ii.4.14<sup>5</sup>: G. M. O. omit the first word; G. M. add *havam*, but no such word follows in the Sanhitā, and the addition is doubtless a copyist’s error—possibly growing out of the attempt to repeat the compound, in its *pada* or *jatā* form). Here both the *pada*-text (as the word is a compound) and the *jatā* (as it stands before a pause) would read *havanagruta iti havana-grutah*, the ordinary *sandhi* being made of *grutah* and *iti*.

### अहारहः सुवरनिंग्यातः ॥ १३ ॥

11. *āvṛd ity evamparo visarjanīyo repham āpnoti. jinv-----: ugn-----:*

12. *apiçabda āvṛtparam<sup>1</sup> visarjanīyam anvādiçati: asāv vi-*  
*sarjanīya itiparo repham āpnoti. iti gr----- anvādeçah kim-*  
*arthah: rtu-----: itih<sup>2</sup> paro yasmād asāv itiparah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. O. -paro; G. M. -para. <sup>2</sup> W. B. iti; O. itiçabdah.

ed. But he replies, reasonably enough, that, as the rule says "when not the final member of a separable word," it is to be inferred that the words specified do occur as such members: and with *hāh* that is not the case; wherefore the distinction would be meaningless with reference to *hāh*. And it would be a poor enough side to take, and altogether unworthy of approval, to give a direction which did not apply to a word itself, but only to that word with a prefixed. Hence the quotation is made in proper form.

Just as long a discussion might have been raised with equal reason over *ahāh* and *suvāh*, both of which are also included in the former rule. So far as *ahāh* is concerned, indeed, it is easy to see that this is the general rule, applying to the cases of occurrence of that word in the main, with a specific restriction; and that *ahar-ahāh* in rule 8 is a sort of exception in advance, made for a single case which would otherwise fall under this restriction (since, in *ahāh-ahāh*, the second *ahāh* is in fact the final member of a compound). But I am unable to discover any justification of the way in which *suvāh* is treated: it is made the subject of two general rules, to the one of which a needed restriction is attached, to the other, not. For *ahāh* and *suvāh*, the present rule should, it seems, have taken distinctly the form of an exception merely: *nā 'hāh-suvār iṅgyāntāv*; 'not, however, *ahāh* and *suvāh*, when final members of compounds;' and *ahāh* should have been separately treated, or else included with them and a further counter-exception added.

## न भिर्यापरः ॥ १४ ॥

14. Not, however, when followed by *bhih* or *bhyām*.

There is violation of the ordinary usage of the Prātiçākhya in this rule also. The only one of the words mentioned in the preceding rule which is found with the case-endings *bhih* and *bhyām* following it is *ahāh*; and hence, to it alone the present precept applies. We should expect it, therefore, in accordance with the principle of which i.58 is an expression, to have been placed last in the trio of which it forms a member. The commentator does not remark upon the irregularity, but simply points out that the

*yānta ity ukter<sup>9</sup> iṅgyāntatvam<sup>10</sup> iti<sup>11</sup> sambhāvanīyam: tac ca hār<sup>12</sup> ity evamrūpe<sup>13</sup> grahanē nā 'stī 'ty<sup>14</sup> atre 'dam viçeshanam anarthakām syāt: tathā 'py<sup>15</sup> evamrūpe mā bhād iti<sup>16</sup>: <sup>16</sup>kīm tv<sup>16</sup> akārāditve bhavati 'ti jaghanyāh pakshāh: na tu saralāh: iti sūtre<sup>17</sup> 'hār<sup>18</sup> iti grahanam upayujyate.*

<sup>1</sup> O. eshu padeshu. <sup>2</sup> W. -yd. <sup>3</sup> W. anīngyāntāh; O. -ta. <sup>4</sup> O. āpnuvānati. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. ity. <sup>7</sup> G. M. 'vd. <sup>8</sup> O. tatra gāuravādoshāp-; G. M. tatra gādugavādeshop-. <sup>9</sup> W. ukten; G. M. O. ukte. <sup>10</sup> G. M. -āntam. <sup>11</sup> G. M. O. apī. <sup>12</sup> G. M. O. -pa. <sup>13</sup> W. om. iti. <sup>14</sup> G. M. O. sati: a better reading. <sup>15</sup> O. om. <sup>16</sup> G. M. om.; O. kīm tv apy. <sup>17</sup> G. M. O. sutardm. <sup>18</sup> MSS. ahār.



expect to hear him reply—because *aḥāḥ* also is twice mentioned, in the same two rules with *suvah*. But no; we do injustice to the tenderness of his exegetical conscience, in supposing him capable of such gross arbitrariness of interpretation, when in rule 8, instead of *aḥāḥ*, *aḥarāḥāḥ* is read. He alleges instead the competency of a form cited for another purpose (compare Rik Pr. i.18, r. liv, 55): we have read in rule iv.11 *aḥorāṭre*, where the *pragrahāḥ* are under treatment, and this suffices, by analogy of form, to determine the reading also of *aḥorāṭrāḍhyāṁ* and *aḥorāṭrayoḥ*. If this be so, it is next retorted, then, as the *sh* of *adhisavane*, which is cited in the same rule, is assured by the citation itself, rule vi.11, prescribing the *sh*, in the way of an exception to an exception, is out of order. That is true, the commentator confesses: but, granting that the *sh* of *sava* is established by the previous mention of *adhisavane*, how is that of *sthāna*, the other word specified in the same rule, established? the rule is therefore to be deemed of force so far as relates to that word, and to be regarded as intended for it. Of what follows, not all is clear to me: it appears that the rule is, after all, defended as it stands, on “the principle of sugar-candy and little tongue” (i. e. as merely giving more than is absolutely required of what one cannot receive too much of, as the palate of candy—?): for to establish the reading on the authority of a previous citation is only doing just what will answer (? *gamanikā* occurs in only one other passage, the comment on i.18, and I find nowhere any thing that explains its use), while specific mention is a distinction; hence the rule has a meaning as applied to *sava* also: such is the understanding.

The commentator might much better, surely, have acknowledged that his text-book had omitted to provide for the special case of *jata*-reading which has caused all this trouble, than have forced it within the contemplation of the rules at such cost.

## दीर्घं च पूर्वः ॥ १७ ॥

17. And the preceding vowel is made long.

The “and” (*ca*) in the rule is declared to signify that the lengthening of the vowel takes place only when *visarjanīya* has been omitted. The cited examples are *rurū rādudrah* (v.5.19), *tittiri rohit* (v.5.16), and *vishṇū rūpam kṛtvā* (vi.2.4<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the last word). As was noticed in the comment upon the preceding rule, there is no such case of *ah* changed to *a* before *r*, except the one forming the special subject of the following rules.

---

17. *taṣṭād rep̄hāparāvisarjanīyil luptāt pūrvo 'pi<sup>1</sup> yah svaro hrasvah sa ca dīrgham dṛpadyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: rurū . . . titti . . . vishṇū . . . yadā<sup>3</sup> visarjanīyasya lopas taddī 'va dīrghatvam yathā syād ity evamarthac caṣabdhā.*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. ins. *tasya*.

18. There can be little question that Vararuci's explanation is the true one.

In rule 21, below, we have yet another mode taught of arriving at the same result as regards the reading.

## द्वावुत्तमोत्तरीयस्य रेफम् ॥२०॥

20. According to Uttamottariya, two become *r*.

Here, again, there are two interpretations, Vararuci giving one, Mâhisheya the other. The former says that, in the opinion of the specified authority (*câkhan*, 'holder of a *câkha* or recension of the sacred text'), the *visarjanîya* of *eshtâh* and the following *r* both become *r*—that is, as I should think it ought to mean, both fuse together into a single *r*: thus, *eshtardâyah*—but none of the manuscripts give this reading in illustrating the case: see the various readings below. Mâhisheya, on the other hand, regards the individual referred to as owning the portentous name Dvâvuttamottariya, and as holding that the *h* of *eshtâh* becomes *r* before *r*, making *eshtar râyah*.

Vararuci here maintains, in my opinion, his usual superiority over Mâhisheya, as regards both the plausibility of the name assumed and the admissibility of the reading taught; and I have accordingly made my translation conform with his interpretation.

It is interesting to note the uncertainty of the tradition within reach of the commentators as to the personality of the authorities quoted by the Prâtiçâkhyâ.

## सांकृत्यस्योकारम् ॥२१॥

21. According to Sâmkryta, the *visarjanîya* becomes *u*.

And this *u*, by x.5, unites with the preceding *a* to form *o*, so that the reading of the passage is *eshto râyah*, as it is according

19. *ekeshâm mata eshtar iti visarjanîyo rephaparo na lupyate: ata eva pûrvasvaradirghâbhâvaç ca: kiñ tu ghoshavatparâç ca* (ix.8) 'ity otvam<sup>1</sup>. yathâ: *eshto râyah*. vararuciviracitam etat<sup>2</sup>: mâhisheyabhdshitam tv<sup>3</sup> evam: *eshtar iti visarjanîyo rephaparo* 'repham nâ<sup>4</sup> "padyata iti". \*siddharûpam ubhayoh sâmanam.

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ca. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *na*repham ápnoti. <sup>5</sup> O. om. *na*.

20. *uttamottariyasya gâkhino<sup>1</sup> mata eshtar iti visarjanîyas<sup>2</sup> tatparo rephâç ca dvâv etâu repham ápadyete. yathâ: eshtar<sup>3</sup> râyah. ayam artho vârârucokta<sup>4</sup>: mâhisheyoktas tu dvâvuttamottariya iti kasya cin nâma: tanmata eshtar<sup>5</sup> iti visarjanîyo rephaparo repham ápadyate: <sup>6</sup> eshtar<sup>7</sup> râya iti*.

<sup>1</sup> O. -nor, <sup>2</sup> G. M. -yaç ca. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. -tâ; O. -târ. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. var-. <sup>5</sup> W. B. eshtâ râya. <sup>6</sup> O. ins. yâlhâ. <sup>7</sup> B. G. M. -tâ. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. om.

23. At the end of the former member of a compound, before *k*, *kh*, or *p*, *visarjanīya* becomes *sh*—or *s*, if preceded by *a*.

The commentator notes the fact that, as a different following occasion is here introduced, the implication “followed by a vowel or a sonant consonant,” which has so long been in force (namely, since rule 3 of this chapter), comes to an end. His illustrative examples are: *atho havishkṛtāndm eva* (vi.4.3<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *eva*), *grasitām nishkhidati* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the first word), *bahishpavamāna upasadyah* (vi.4.9<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word), *namaskṛair evdī 'nam* (v.5.7<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *enam*), and *pathaspāthah paripatim* (i.1.14<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word). As counter-example, to show that the *h* must end the first member of a compound, not an independent word, we have *pushpāvatih prasavatih* (iv.2.6<sup>1</sup>), and *namah pitrbhyo abhi* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have *abhi*).

This is a general rule, applying to almost all the compounds in the Sanhitā which show a final *h* before an initial *k*, *kh*, or *p* of the second member. A few exceptions are mentioned farther on (rules 32, 33).

आविनिरितःशश्वतोऽपसोलिवरिषोऽङ्गसोऽतिदिवोवि-  
श्वतोऽश्मनस्तमसः ॥ २४ ॥

24. Also in *āvih*, *nih*, *idah*, *çaçvatah*, *apasah*, *deva rishah*, *añhasah*, *ati divah*, *viçvatah*, *açmanah*, and *tamasah*.

This rule, the commentator remarks, relates to words which are not first members of compounds. His examples are: for *āvih*, *āvish kṛṇushva* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>). For *nih*, *ghṛtañ nish pibati* (ii.3.11<sup>5</sup>):

23. *atī paranimittavīgeshāñdā etatparyantā svaraghoshavat-*  
*parānuvṛttī mantavyā. avagrahāntavartī visarjanīyah kakādra-*  
*khakārapakāraparah shakāram āpadyate: akārapārvāc cet sukā-*  
*ram. yathā<sup>6</sup>: atho<sup>7</sup>: gras<sup>8</sup>... bahish<sup>9</sup>... namas<sup>10</sup>...  
 pathas<sup>11</sup>... avagraha iti kim: push<sup>12</sup>... namah<sup>13</sup>... ka-*  
*kāraç ca khakāraç ca pakāraç ca kakhapakārāh: te<sup>14</sup> pare<sup>15</sup> ya-*  
*mād asāv<sup>16</sup> tathoktah. akārah pūrvo yasmād asāv akārapārvāh.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -shād. <sup>2</sup> W. etāvātp-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -paratvān-. <sup>4</sup> W. -havatara; B. -ha; G. M. -havartī. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> O. ete. <sup>7</sup> G. M. pard. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. sa.

24. <sup>1</sup>... eshu<sup>1</sup> visarjanīyah kakhapakāraparo <sup>2</sup> yathāvihī-  
*tam<sup>3</sup> bhajate. yathā<sup>4</sup>: āvish<sup>5</sup>... ghṛtañ<sup>6</sup>... idas<sup>7</sup>...  
 çāçv<sup>8</sup>... apasas<sup>9</sup>... uror<sup>10</sup>... deve 'ti kim: sa<sup>11</sup>... añ-  
 hasas<sup>12</sup>... ati<sup>13</sup>... ati 'ti kim: divah<sup>14</sup>... viçv<sup>15</sup>... tvam<sup>16</sup>... ud<sup>17</sup>...  
 anavagrahārtha 'yan drambhāh.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. āvirādīshu vīdyamāno. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. hi shakāram akārapārvāc cet sa-  
*kāram iti. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -ihśañh-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om.*

By its terms, the rule means that the prescription of the preceding rule becomes void when either of the words there mentioned is followed as here specified; but the cases of its application, so far as I am aware, all concern *krdhi*. The commentator's illustrations are: *tān ma āmanasah krdhi svādhā* (ii.3.9<sup>1</sup>: only W. has the first two words, and it omits the last one), *gām ca nah krdhi*: *kravē dakshāya* (iii.3.11<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the last word), and *uru kshayāya nah krdhi*: *ghrtam ghrtayone* (i.3.4<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word); and to the second of these there is a counter-example, *uta no mayas krdhi kshayadvirāya* (iv.5.10<sup>2</sup>), to show that only *kr*, not *k* alone, gives occasion for retention of the *h*. The words *āmanasah krdhi svādhā* occur again at ii.3.9<sup>2</sup>: I find no other cases to be specified in addition to those quoted by the commentator.

### पतीवेपतीपतेपतयेपतिष्ठतिंपरः ॥ २७ ॥

27. Also before *patnī ve*, *patī*, *pate*, *pataye*, *patih*, and *patim*.

The examples are: first, *brahmaṇas patnī vedim* (iii.5.6<sup>1</sup>), with a counter-example, to show that the word *patnī* must be followed by *ve*, *reto dhāḥ patnī va ity aha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>: but O. reads *indriyāvataḥ patnīvantam*, i.4.27); further, *guḥhas patī idam aham* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>: only O. has *aham*), *vāstosh pate prati* (iii.4.10<sup>1</sup>), *pracyavasva bhūwas pate* (i.2.9 and vi.1.11<sup>4</sup>), *vācas pataye pavasva* (i.4.2), *vācas patir vācam* (i.7.7<sup>1</sup>), and *vācas patim viśvakarṇam-nam utaye* (iv.6.2<sup>5</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word). The inquiry is now raised, why it was necessary to give all these words in detail, instead of comprehending them all in *pat*, and in reply is quoted the passage *divāṁ gacha suvah pata* (iv.1.10<sup>5</sup> and v.1.10<sup>5</sup>).

The cases of retention of *s* before the cases of *pati* are so numerous, that it would be highly convenient to be able to dispose of them at once by quoting in the rule the theme *pati*; but such a proceeding is permitted (by i.22) only with themes ending in *a*. I add the other combinations of this class which I have noted from the Sanhitā: *manasas pati* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>; 4.44<sup>3</sup>), *pathas pati* (i.1.14<sup>2</sup>), *brahmaṇas pati* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup>; ii.1.57), *jyotiṣhas pati* (i.5.11<sup>1</sup>; iv.4.4<sup>6</sup>), *cavasas pati* (ii.2.12<sup>7</sup>), *jagatas pati* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>), *sadasas pati* (ii.6.8<sup>2</sup>; iii.2.4<sup>4</sup>), *catinas pati* (ii.6.11<sup>1</sup>; iv.4.4<sup>1</sup>), *nabhasas pati* (iii.3.8<sup>3,6</sup>), and *yas patih* (iv.7.14<sup>3</sup>). We have the genitive *pateh* in *bṛhās-pateh* (i.7.8<sup>4</sup>), but, as the *pada*-text reads *bṛhāh-pateh*, the word does not fall under this rule: *tapaspati* (i.2.10<sup>2</sup>; p. *tapah-patiḥ*)

27. ----- evam paro visarjantyo yathāvihitam<sup>1</sup> bhajate. ya-thā<sup>2</sup>: brah-----: va iti kim: reto-----: guḥh-----: vāst-----: pra-----: vāc-----: vāc-----: vāc-----: pad ity etāvatāi 'va siddhe 'pratipadapātīena kim<sup>3</sup>: divāṁ----- ityādinishedhār-thāh<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. -vidhim. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -ṭhāḥ kimarthāḥ; O. -tho. <sup>4</sup> O. -ddāu n.

to show that only *po*, not *p* when otherwise followed, calls out the prescribed effect in *rāyah*.

I have not attempted to note the numerous instances of the occurrence of *rāyas posha* in the Sanhitā. In the derivative *rāyas poshavani* (i.2.12<sup>3</sup>; 3.1<sup>2</sup>), where the division is before *vani*, the *pada*-text, according to its custom, leaves the *s* of *rāyas* unchanged (reading *rāyasposha-vani*).

## नमस्करोपरः ॥ ३० ॥

30. Also in *namah*, before *karo*.

The examples illustrating the action of the rule are *samvatsarena namas karomi* (v.5.7<sup>3</sup>), and *ubhayibhyo namas karoti* (ii.6.9<sup>8</sup>: O. reads *karomi*); counter-examples, showing the uselessness of either specification of the rule without the other, are *namah karpardine ca* (iv.5.5<sup>1,9</sup>: W. omits *ca*; O. omits the example), and *ekahāyanād enah karoti* (vi.6.3<sup>1</sup>).

Other instances of *namas karoti* are found at v.5.5<sup>1,7</sup>; vi.3.8<sup>4</sup>; and of *-vatsarena namas karomi* at v.5.7<sup>3</sup> twice, 7<sup>4</sup> twice.

The printed text has *greyasas karat* and *vasyasas karat* (but, by a strange inconsistency, immediately after, *pacunatah karat*) at i.8.6<sup>2</sup>; but, as these combinations are unauthorized by the Prātiçākhya, and not supported by my manuscript, I do not doubt that the readings are erroneous.

## वसुष्ककारपरः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Also in *vasuh*, before *k*.

The passage is *sa idhāno vasush kaviḥ* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>), and I have found no other. Counter-examples, of obvious application, are given: *viprah gucih kaviḥ* (i.3.14<sup>8</sup>; 5.5<sup>3</sup>), *mayi vasuh puro vasuh* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>), and *vigvāvasuh pary amushnāt* (vi.1.6<sup>3</sup>, 11<sup>5</sup>: B., which is quite defective just along here, omits the first word).

## नाधरं विश्वतोऽन्तर्जीतो विविश्रुः पूनः ॥ ३२ ॥

30. *nama ity atra<sup>1</sup> visarjanīyah karo ity evamparo yathāvihitam<sup>2</sup> bhajate. yathā<sup>3</sup>: samv-----: ubhay----- 'karo iti kim: namah-----:<sup>4</sup> nama iti kim: ekah-----<sup>5</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -vidhim. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om.; B. omits to here. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. put before *ubhay*; B. puts after *ubhay*-----, and om. *karo iti*.

31. *'vasur ity atra visarjanīyah kakāraparo yathāvihitam<sup>2</sup> dpadyate<sup>3</sup>. yathā<sup>4</sup>: sa----- vasur iti kim: viprah-----: evamparo iti kim: mayi-----: vigvā-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -vidhim. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. bhajate. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om.

*bahihparidhi skandat* (ii.6.6<sup>2</sup> and vi.2.8<sup>5</sup>: the same divisions contain each a second example of the compound), *purushahpurushonidhanam* (vi.6.3<sup>2</sup>: the same division contains a second example of the compound), and *ubhayatahpshnūr bhavati* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>). I have noted besides only *parushahparushah pari* (iv.2.9<sup>2</sup>). That the word containing *dh* or *sh* must follow the *visarjanīya*, not be the one that itself ends in that letter, is shown by the counter-examples *adhaspadam kṛṇute* (iv.7.13<sup>3</sup>), and *r̥tasya jyotishas patim* (i.5.11<sup>1</sup>).

## परिवाप्रपरः ॥३४॥

### 34. Not before *pari vā* or *pra*.

The examples are *rocanā divah pari vājeshu* (iv.2.11<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first word)—with the counter-example *divas pari pra-thamam* (i.8.14<sup>5</sup> and iv.2.2<sup>1</sup>), to show the need of citing *vā* after *pari*—and *tasmād itahpradānam devdh* (iii.2.9<sup>7</sup>: O. omits *devdh*). Of these, the first is an exception under viii.28; the other, under viii.28. There is yet another passage, *bahihprāno vā manushyah* (vi.1.1<sup>4</sup>), which needs to be brought under the rule; and the commentator accordingly declares that the quotation of *pra* in this rule with short *a* is intended to connote *prā* also—just as, in a rule of the next chapter (ix.24), *athā* connotes *atha* also, by a converse principle. This, however, suggests a difficulty: why then is not rule vii.7, prescribing for *prā* an effect which had already been

---

*nā "padyate. yashd": bahih----: puru----: ubhay----: kakhapakāra* (viii.28) *iti prāptih. parabhāta iti kim: adhas----*: *r̥tasya-----*<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ca*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. ins. *sūtre*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *dhaśārap*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *shakārap*. <sup>5</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>6</sup> O. om.; G. M. *pūrvav-*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *vidhim*. <sup>8</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>9</sup> B. *-rapara*. <sup>10</sup> W. adds *tasmīn iti nidiṣṭe pūrvasya parivāpravarah*.

34. *pari vā: pra: <sup>1</sup> evam paro visarjanīyo yathāvihitam<sup>2</sup> nā "padyate. rocanā----: ve 'ti kim: divas----: tasmād---- pre 'ti hrasvagrahanam dīrghasyā 'py upalakshanam: <sup>3</sup> yatho 'datihāparāc ca (ix.24) iti dīrghagrahanam hrasvayo 'palakshanārtham<sup>4</sup>. tarhi prāpūrvāc ca (vii.7) iti sūtram vyartham: praçabdasyā <sup>5</sup> 'nuvṛttasyādi 'va dīrghopalakshakatvād<sup>6</sup>: iti cet: ucyate: pratyakshagṛhitasyādi 'vo 'palakshakatvam<sup>7</sup> nā 'nukrṣṭasye 'ti vijñeyam: <sup>8</sup> tathā hi: vāhanau hyamānah (vii.6) ity atra<sup>9</sup> cakārena praçabdās tatrā 'nukṛṣṭāḥ: atra tu<sup>10</sup> parivāprapara<sup>11</sup> ity <sup>10</sup> upalakshakatvam<sup>11</sup> bhavati. tathā sati 'dam apy udāharanam: bahih----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *vidhim*. <sup>3</sup> B. ins. <sup>(4)</sup> here, as well as below, in its place. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *-nam*; B. *hrasvop-*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *eva*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-kshanatvād*; O. *dīrghagrahanasyop-*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-tvāt*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *vā*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. ins. *prapara iti pratyakshagṛhitatvād*; O. ins. *pratyakshagṛhitatvād*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *-kshanam*.

## CHAPTER IX.

CONTENTS: 1–6, treatment of final *h* before initial surd letters; 7–10, treatment of final *ah* and *dh*; 11–15, of final diphthongs before initial vowels; 16–17, of the particle *u*; 18–19, duplication of final *n̄* and *n*; 20–24, conversion of final *dn̄*, *in*, *un̄*, to *dn̄*, *in̄r*, *un̄r*.

**अष्मपरो झोषपरे लुप्यते काण्डमायनस्य ॥१॥**

1. *Visarjanīya*, when followed by a spirant which has a surd letter after it, is dropped, according to Kāndamāyana.

The commentator, after a brief paraphrase of the rule, gives a couple of examples to illustrate its working: namely, *catusṭandm̄ karoti* (v.1.6<sup>4</sup>; p. *catusṭ-standm̄*), and *vāyava stho'pāyava stha* (i.1.1). The mention of Kāndamāyana is declared to be made on account of a difference of views: others, namely, hold that *h* is dropped before a spirant that is followed by a sonant letter as well, as *adbhya'svāhā* (i.8.18<sup>3</sup>), *ye cūkla syus tam* (ii.8.1<sup>3</sup>: W. B. omit *tam*), *yo hatamānā svayampāpah* (ii.2.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *yo*; G. M. omit *pāpah*), and *dānakāmā me prajā syuh* (ii.2.8<sup>3</sup>; 3.4<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the first word; G. M., the first two). I am not sure that I understand the consideration further alleged, in view of which it is decided that “the rule is all right;” it appears to be that, reference having thus been made to a discordance of views, those words will be hereafter specified in which there is omission made under any other prescription—but what this refers to, I am unable to see.

Every MS. that I have reads ‘*ghoshaparo* as second word in the rule: but the comment so plainly implies the reading *-pare*, and the sense so obviously requires it, that I have ventured its adoption.

Although the prescription here given is put upon the authority of an individual, it is pretty evidently to be regarded as definitely

1. *ūshmaparo visarjanīyah kāndamāyanasya mate lupyate*  
*tasminn īshmany aghoshavatpare<sup>1</sup> sati. yathā: catu-----: vāy-----*  
*kāndamāyanagrahāṇam<sup>2</sup> vikalpārtham: anyeshām mate*  
*ghoshavatpare<sup>3</sup> py īshmani visarjanīyo lupyate: yathā: adbhyā -----*  
*ye-----: yo-----: dāna----- evam ca vikalpāgrayane<sup>4</sup>*  
*sati lakshanāntaragataṁ<sup>5</sup> yeshu padeshu lupyate tāni paddni*  
*vakshyāma<sup>6</sup> iti vacanām saralam bhavati.*

*ūshmā paro yasmāt<sup>7</sup> asāv īshmaparah<sup>8</sup>: na ghoshavān aghoshah: asdrū paro yasmāt<sup>9</sup> sa tathoktaḥ<sup>8</sup>: tasminn aghoshapare.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. oni. vat. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -yanasya gr-. <sup>3</sup> W. -pravane; O. -grayagrahane  
 G. M. -lpāntare. <sup>4</sup> W. O. -ṇātara-. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. prav-. <sup>(6)</sup> G. M. sa tātho 'ktih  
<sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(8)</sup> G. M. om.

3. But not when followed by *ksh*.

That is to say, *visarjanīya* remains unchanged before *ksh*, the preceding rule for its conversion to *jihvāmālīya* being annulled. There is nothing corresponding to the usage here prescribed in either of the other treatises. The commentator quotes a number of examples: *manah ksheme* (v.2.1<sup>1</sup>), *ubhayatahkshnār bhavati* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit *bhavati*: the *visarjanīya* was exempted from conversion into *s* before the *k* by viii.33), *ghandghanah kshobha-nah* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>), *puruṣaḥ kshiyate* (iii.1.7<sup>1</sup>), and *dyāuh kshāma-rerihat* (iv.2.1<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word).

कपवर्गपरश्चाग्निवेश्यवाल्मीकियोः ॥४॥

4. Nor, according to Āgniveçya and Vālmiki, when followed by a guttural or a labial mute.

The two authorities here specified (the commentator calls them “holders of a çākha, teachers”), it appears, reject altogether the *jihvāmālīya* and *upadhmānīya*, since they prescribe the retention of *visarjanīya* in the only situations where those problematical sounds are liable to arise. The commentator quotes a couple of illustrative passages: *yah kāmayeta* (ii.1.2<sup>a</sup> et al.), and *agnih pagur asit* (v.7.26: O. has dropped out what follows *agnih*). Then, to show that on other points these heterodox persons accept our rule 2, he cites *madhus ca mādhavaç ca* (i.4.14 and iv.4.11<sup>1</sup>), *manas tatvāya* (iv.1.1<sup>1</sup>: but B. substitutes *namas talpyāya*, iv.5.9<sup>1</sup>), *āguṣ cīgānah* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>), *yas somāñ vamiti* (ii.3.2<sup>6</sup>).

उत्तमपर एवैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥५॥

5. According to some authorities, not when followed by a spirant, and only then.

I believe there can be no real doubt as to the meaning of this rule, although it is not very explicitly interpreted by the commen-

3. *kshaparo visarjanīyah pūrvavidhim na bhajate. yathā<sup>1</sup>:*  
*man-----: ubhay-----: ghanā-----: pūrv-----: dyāuh-----:*  
*kshakārasyā'ghoshavattvāt praptih.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om.

4. <sup>1</sup>*cakāro nishedham dkarshati. āgniveçyavālmīkyoh<sup>1</sup> çākhi-nor ācāryayor<sup>2</sup> mate<sup>3</sup> kavargaparah pavargaparo vā<sup>4</sup> pūrvavidhim 'nā "padyate". yah----: agnih---- kakāraç ca pakāraç ca kapāru: tayor vargāu<sup>5</sup> kapavargāu: tāu parāu yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ. evampara iti kim: madhus----: manas----: āguṣ----: yas----*

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. om.; O. *caçabdo nañdkarshakah: agn-* <sup>(2)</sup> O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> O. *kapavargaparo visarjanīyah.* <sup>(4)</sup> O. *na bhajate.* <sup>(5)</sup> O. *kavargaç ca pavargaç ca.*

to mean “in the opinion of these two authorities, it does not—that is, *h* does not follow the prescription of rule 2 either before a guttural or palatal mute or before a spirant.” This is equivalent to a ratification of rule 4, and a ratification or rejection of rule 5, according as we adopt the one or the other of the two interpretations proposed for the latter; and it is, in my view, quite unsuited to the connection. The discordant explanations of some of the other views of designated authorities given in the rules of the treatise show us that the commentators had not in all cases, at least, any certain knowledge by tradition of the matters referred to, but simply interpreted as well as they were able the notices of their text-book—and we have the same right as they in this respect. If the particular point here under discussion were of more practical consequence, I should be inclined to go into a fuller discussion of it; as the case stands, it has perhaps cost us already more words than it is worth.

The commentator illustrates by repeating several of the quotations already given—namely *yah kāmayeta* (ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al.), *yah pāpmaṇḍ* (ii.1.3<sup>5</sup> et al.), *āguḥ gīgñāḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>): these as direct examples; as counter-example, according to W. O., *manas tatvāya* (iv.1.1<sup>1</sup>), for which B. once more substitutes *namas talpyāya* (iv.5.9<sup>1</sup>), while G. M. read *agnīc ca me* (iv.7.6<sup>1</sup>)—the readings of which, as regards the *visarjanīya*, each manuscript gives in its usual fashion (except that W. has this time *āguḥ gīgñāḥ*, by a blundering divergence in the wrong direction), so that we are deprived of any farther aid from that quarter to the understanding of the rule.

Finally, rules 4–6 are declared not approved.

### ओकारमः सर्वी ज्कारपरः ॥७॥

7. *Ah*, the whole of it, when followed by *a*, becomes *o*.

The commentator's cited examples are *preddho agne* (iv.6.5<sup>4</sup> and v.4.7<sup>3</sup>), *samiddho añjan* (v.1.11<sup>1</sup>), and *so 'bravit* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.). He then enters into a long exposition intended to prove the necessity of the specification *sarvāh*, ‘the whole of it,’ in the rule. Without it, we are told, the reading *samiddho añjan* (in the second example given) would not be established: for, by i.56, alteration and omission concern only a single letter; hence, if *sarvāh* were omitted, only the final *visarjanīya* would be converted to *o*; this, with the preceding *a*, would become *au* by x.7; the *au* would

---

7. *ahsarvo visarjanīya<sup>1</sup> otvam<sup>2</sup> bhajate 'kāraparal<sup>3</sup>:* *ahsarva*  
*ity akārena sahe<sup>4</sup> 'ty arthah. pre-----: sam-----: so-----:* *ah-*  
*sarva iti kim: samiddho añjann iti na sidhyet<sup>5</sup>: kim tu vār-*  
*nasya vikāralopāv* (i.56) *iti visarjanīyamātrasya syād*  
*otvam: tata okāraukāraparah* (x.7) *ity āukāre kṛta ukāra*  
*dvām* (ix.15) *ity dvādeṣāḥ: tathā sati<sup>6</sup> samiddhāv añjann iti*  
*syāt. 'yad vā<sup>7</sup> svaraparo yakāram* (ix.10) *iti yatvam<sup>8</sup>*

ix.10 (as pointed out in the comment to viii.5), rule 7 of this chapter ought to teach that “*visarjanīya*, when preceded by *a*, becomes *o* along with the latter, when *a* follows;” instead of which a new subject, “the whole syllable *ah*,” is introduced there; and *visarjanīya*, being thus replaced by something else in rules 7 and 8, ought to drop out of view altogether, or, if needed further, to be distinctly specified over again. But we find it implied without specification in the present rule; and, farther, the being followed by a sonant consonant is brought down “by vicinage” from rule 8, while the *tu*, ‘but,’ the commentator says, merely annuls the being followed by *a*, as specified in rule 7. This is little less than absurd: if the sequence of *a* was to be annulled at all, it should have been so in rule 8—or, rather, it was annulled by rule 8, and needs to be made no further account of. The *tu* is here, as often elsewhere, a simple sign of a change of subject, and the commentator’s attempt to give it a precise significance is—also, as often elsewhere—a failure. Our rule means, by its terms, that *ah*, *āh*, and *āśh* lose their *h* before a sonant consonant; only, as *ah* was already specially provided for by rule 8, it virtually applies only to *āh* and *āśh*. The statement is thus made more general than is needed for the case in hand, because the whole implication of “preceded by any *a*-vowel” is needed for rule 10, which is to teach that *ah*, *āh*, and *āśh* before a vowel—here, again, with the exception of *ah* before *a*, already provided for—convert their *h* into *y*, preliminary to dropping it altogether, by x.19. But rule 10 presents a more anomalous combination of two heterogeneous matters into one precept than is easily to be paralleled elsewhere in the Pratiçākhyā. It is really made up of two independent parts: one, *atha svaraparah*, ‘Now then, when followed by a vowel,’ which is an introductory heading having force through this chapter and the next; the other, *visarjanīyo yakāram*, ‘*h* becomes *y*;’ and their combination is made in order that the implication of *visarjanīya* and also of *avarṇapūrva* may be made from what precedes, and may not require to be distinctly stated.

The commentator’s examples of the application of the rule are *devā gātrividah* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>; 4.44<sup>3</sup>: vi.6.2<sup>3</sup>), and *vicityah somās na vicityās iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>; *somās* for *somāśh*, by protraction from *somah*: G. M. omit the last two words, O. the last three). He adds, as his exposition of the connection of the rule, that the express spe-

---

9. *avarṇapūrvo ghoshavatparas tu<sup>1</sup> visarjanīyo hupyate: hravapūrvasyādū 'kāra<sup>2</sup> eva dīrghapūrvasyā<sup>3</sup> plutapūrvusya ca lopah. yathā: devā-----: viṣ----- okāram ah sarvo 'kāraparāh*  
(ix.7) *ity akāraparātvam pratyakshām tuçabdena nivartyā "numānikām ghoshavatparātvam parigṛhyate sāmūnidhyāt: asyā 'nuvartanam evā 'bhishṭam atre 'ti pūrvasūtradvayasya<sup>4</sup> pr̥thak-karanam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. ins. *sah*. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. *vikāra*. <sup>3</sup> B. -*rva*; O. -*gha*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*trasya*.

Of which, then, the *y* is lost by x.19, leaving only *a*; and this, by x.25, is not liable to further combination. The commentator's examples are *ima evā smāi* (ii.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and *ta enam bhishajyanti* (ii.3.11<sup>4</sup>).

## ओकारो ज्वम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. *O* becomes *av*.

The example is *vishnav e'hi'dam* (ii.4.12<sup>2</sup>). For the further treatment of the *v* thus produced, see x.19 and the following rules.

## नाकारपरौ ॥ १३ ॥

13. But not, in either case, when followed by *a*.

The dual number of the attribute in this rule, we are told, sufficiently shows that the two letters *e* and *o*, last mentioned, are its subject. There are two different rules in the treatise applying to the case of a final *e* or *o* coming to stand before initial *a*—namely rule 11, above [or rule 12], and rule xi.1, which directs that the latter shall be elided—and, since the rules of this chapter are of paramount force, as preceding the other, the present precept is required in order to annul them.

The commentator's examples are *mā te asyām* (i.6.12<sup>5</sup>), *samidhō añjan* (v.1.11<sup>1</sup>), and *te bruvan* (ii.5.1<sup>3</sup> et al.).

## ऐकार आयम् ॥ १४ ॥

14. *Ai* becomes *ay*.

11. <sup>1</sup>*visṛshṭo visarjanīyah*<sup>1</sup>. *idam*<sup>2</sup> *idanīm ucyate*: *svaraparah padānta*<sup>3</sup> *ekaro 'yam iti vikāram āpadyate*. *ima*.....: *ta*.....

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. *visargo nivrittaḥ*; O. *visargo vinirgataḥ*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. -*tah*; R. -*te*.

12. *svaraparah*<sup>1</sup> *padānta okaro 'yam iti*<sup>2</sup> *vikāram āpadyate*. *yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *vish*.....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *svaraḥ*. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> W. B. G. M. om.

13. *dvivacanasāmarthyagrhitāv*<sup>1</sup> *ekārāukārdv akāraparādū*<sup>2</sup> *pūrvavidhim*<sup>3</sup> *na prāpnutaḥ*. *yathā*<sup>4</sup>: *mā*....: *sam*....: *te*....: *ity ādāv ekāro 'yam* (ix.11) <sup>5</sup> *lupyate tv akāra ekārāukārapurvaḥ* (xi.1) *iti* <sup>6</sup> *sūtradvayam prasaktam*: *tatrā 'pi pūrvatvat prabalam*<sup>7</sup> *yatvavidhim nisheddhum ayam drambhaḥ*. *akārah paro yābhyaṁ tāv akāraparādū*.

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. O. -*hyāt gr-*; and G. M. O. add *sannihitāv*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. *pūrva*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *iti ca*; O. ins. *iti*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. ins. *ca*. <sup>7</sup> O. ins. *ekārasya*.

a consonant and preceding a vowel. Compare the similar rules in the other treatises (Rik Pr. ii.28; Vāj. Pr. iv.87; Ath. Pr. iii.36). The preceding precept being thus annulled with reference to these two cases, they fall under the general rule x.15, and the *u*, like any final, is converted into *v*. To show the bearing of the specification *sāṁhitāḥ*, ‘in combined text,’ the commentator gives us the two passages in *pada* and *krama* form: thus—tat: *u*: *dhuh*: *tvā* *u*: *uv* *dhuh*: *dhur utsṛjyam* (but G. M. O. give simply the first two *krama-pada*’s), and *tasmād*: *u*: *dgyam*: *tasmād u*: *uv dgayam* (here only W. has the statement in *pada*). It thus appears that the combination with the preceding consonant is indispensable to the treatment of the *u* as here prescribed; failing that, it falls under the preceding rule, and becomes *uv*.

### ह्रस्वपूर्वो उकारो द्विवर्णम् ॥१८॥

18. A *n̄*, when preceded by a short vowel, is doubled.

That is to say, when another vowel follows—the heading *atha svaraparah* (ix.10) still continuing in force. The commentator adds also “when occurring at the end of a *pada*,” as he has done in his paraphrase of the preceding rules: this is a matter of course, as we are dealing only with the conversion of *pada*-text into *sāṁhitā*. His illustrative examples are *nyaññ agnih* (v.5.3<sup>2</sup>), and *tam u tvā dadhyāññ rshih* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup> and v.1.4<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words). That the preceding vowel must be short, he shows by *parāñ ñ varata* (iii.2.9<sup>7</sup> and vi.3.8<sup>3</sup>); that a vowel must follow, by *sadrīk samāññāñ syāt* (ii.2.8<sup>6</sup>: only O. has the last word; only B. G. M. have the inserted *k*, required by v.32, and G. M. convert it to *kh*, by xiv.12), and *pratyāñk shadahāñ* (vii.4.2<sup>5</sup>: here all have the *k*, but only G. M. make it *kh*).

17. tat *tasmād ity<sup>1</sup>* etdbhyām sāṁhita ukāro ‘prktāḥ pūrvavividhīm nā ”pnoti<sup>2</sup>: prakṛtyāvasthānāñ vakāraç<sup>3</sup> ca na bhavati”ty arthaḥ. t ad . . . : *tasmād . . . ivarṇokārāu yavakārdv* (x.15) *iti daçame<sup>4</sup> ‘sya<sup>5</sup> vidhir vakshyate<sup>6</sup>*. tat *tasmād sāñhita iti kim: tat . . . : tasm . . .*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ”padyate; O. prāpn-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. -rāgamaç. <sup>4</sup> O. -ma. <sup>5</sup> B. tasya. <sup>6</sup> O. ins. *tasya purastādapavādō yam*.

18. <sup>1</sup>*svaraparo ḥakārah padāñtavarti hrasvapūrvo<sup>1</sup> dvivarnam*  
<sup>2</sup>*bhajate. yathā<sup>3</sup>: nyaññ . . . : tam . . . hrasvapūrva iti kim:*  
*par . . . : svarapara iti kim: sad . . . : praty . . . hrasvah*  
*pūrvo yasmād asdu hrasvapūrvah: dvayor varṇayoḥ samāhāro*  
*dvivarnam.*

<sup>1</sup>) G. M. arrange *hr- sv- pad- ḥak-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. ins. *dvitvam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

As in other similar cases, the commentator, after his preliminary paraphrase of the rule, proceeds first to define the passages of the Sanhitā designated by the titles it contains. By *graha* is meant the fourth chapter of the first book, excepting its last four sections—or i.4.1–42. By *ukhya*, the first two chapters of the “Agni” book (see iii.9), excepting their final sections (which are *yājyās*)—or iv.1.1–10; 2.1–10. The *yājyās* have been already defined (iii.9, note), as the concluding sections of all the chapters to book fourth, chapter third, together with ii.6.11. By *prshthyā* are intended nine sections, pointed out by the citation of the first words of each: they are iv.4.12; 6.6–9; 7.15: v.1.11; 2.11; 2.12. *Hiranyavarnīya* designates only a single section, v.6.1. Examples are then given from each set of passages. From *graha* passages, we have *jahi cātriñr apa mṛdho mudasva* (i.iv.42), and *marutvāñ indra vr̄shabhaḥ* (i.4.19: G. M. O. omit the last word): there are four other cases, at i.4.20 twice, 21,41. From *ukhya* passages, *ye vā vanaspatiñr anu* (iv.2.8<sup>2</sup>), and *madhumāñ astu sūryah* (iv.2.9<sup>2</sup>): there are ten others, at iv.1.3<sup>3</sup> twice, 9<sup>2,3</sup>, 10<sup>2,4</sup>; 2.4<sup>2,5<sup>1</sup></sup>, 9<sup>5</sup> twice. From *yājyā* passages, *ṛtūñr rtupate yaje 'ha* (iv.3.13<sup>4</sup>: only O. has the last two words), to which W. B. O. add *amavāñ ibhena* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>); but for this G. M. substitute *madhumāñ indriyāvāñ* (iii.1.10<sup>2</sup>), which is not in a *yājyā* passage at all, but falls under the next rule: I have noted more than thirty other cases, namely at i.1.14<sup>4</sup>; 2.14<sup>2</sup>; 3.14<sup>8</sup>; 4.46<sup>2</sup>; 5.11<sup>2</sup>; 6.12<sup>4</sup>; 7.13<sup>4,5</sup>: ii.1.11<sup>5</sup> thrice; 2.12<sup>3,8</sup>; 3.14<sup>2,6</sup>; 6.11<sup>1</sup> thrice<sup>4</sup> twice, 12<sup>1,8</sup>; iii.1.11<sup>1</sup> thrice, 7; 2.11<sup>3</sup> twice; 4.11<sup>8</sup>; 5.11<sup>2</sup>: iv.2.11<sup>3</sup>; 3.13<sup>2,3<sup>4</sup></sup> twice. The same passages contain five exceptions, which are duly provided for in rules 23 and 24, below. From *prshthyā* passages, the examples are *cātrūñr anapavyayantah* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>) and *jaghañāñ upa jighnate* (iv.6.6<sup>5</sup>): other cases at iv.6.7<sup>5,9<sup>4</sup></sup> twice; 7.15<sup>7</sup>: v.1.11<sup>4</sup>. Finally,

---

*kāñ varjayitvā "da de grāv d<sup>o</sup>* (i.4.1<sup>1</sup>) *iti praçnah: agnikāñda-*  
*syā"dyam praçnadvayam uttamānuvākavarjam ukhyam ḍkhyā-*  
*yate: uktā yājyāḥ: samid diçām* (iv.4.12<sup>1</sup>) *jimūtasya*  
*(iv.6.6<sup>1</sup>) yad akrandah* (iv.6.7<sup>1</sup>) *mā no mitrah* (iv.6.8<sup>1</sup>) *ye*  
*vājinam* (iv.6.9<sup>1</sup>) *agner manve* (iv.7.15<sup>1</sup>) *samiddho añjan*  
*(v.1.11<sup>1</sup>) gāyatri* (v.2.11<sup>1</sup>). *kas tvā* (v.2.12<sup>1</sup>) *ity anuvākanava-*  
*kaṁ prshthyam iti pañhyate<sup>8</sup>: hiranyavarnāḥ* (v.6.1<sup>1</sup>) *ity*  
*anuvāko hiranyavarnīyah.* <sup>9</sup>*grahe yathā: jahi----: mar----*  
*ukhye: ye----: madh----. yājyāsu: ṛtūñr----: ama----*  
*prshthyē: cātr----: jagh----. hiranyavarnīye: agniñr----:*  
*sarv----. anitipara iti kim: abhy----: idā----. grahādi-*  
*shv iti kim: trīn----: paçūn----: tān----.*  
*itiḥ paro yasmād asāv itiparah: ne'tiparo 'nitiparah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. read *grh-* throughout. <sup>2</sup> B. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *ity etasmād anyasvar-*; B. *iti 'ty etad asmād anyas-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *'ntyānuv-*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *vā 'si*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. *ins.*  
*ity*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *anuvākāḥ*. <sup>8</sup> W. B. O. *pachyate*; G. M. *pāthyanie*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om.

the *ut* before *ayān* needed to be quoted along with it. For *amṛtān*, *ud asthām amṛtān anu* (i.2.8<sup>1</sup>). For *duryān*, *bhadrān dur-yān abhy e'hi mām anuvratā ny u* (i.6.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit *mām* etc.): there are two other cases, at i.2.13<sup>1</sup>: vi.2.9<sup>1</sup>; and a single exception, *pra carā soma duryān adityāh* (i.2.10<sup>1</sup>), quoted by the commentator in justification of the restriction “not preceded by *soma*.” For *asmān*, *so asmān adhipatin karotu* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup> and iii.2.7<sup>2</sup>): another example is at v.7.9<sup>1</sup>; and *asmān* becomes *asmāñ* also at i.6.12<sup>4</sup>, but in virtue of the preceding rule. The counter-example, showing the necessity of prefixing *so* in the rule, is *indro asmān asmin dvitīye* (iii.1.9<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit the last word). For *avimān*, *avi-mān aṣvī* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup>; 7.6<sup>7</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>: but the last case falls under the preceding rule also). For *gomān*, *gomān agne* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup>; 7.6<sup>7</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>—that is to say, in the same phrase with *avimān*). For *madhumān*, *madhūmān indriyāvān* (iii.1.10<sup>2</sup>). Next follows a counter-example, intended to show why *mān* would not have been enough of itself to include the last three words, without the prefixed parts *avi*, *go*, and *madhu*: it is *pacumān eva bhavati* (vi.2.6<sup>2</sup> et al.). Then, for *havishmān*, *havishmān ā vivṛsatī* (i.3.12): the word occurs a second time in the same section, and also at vi.4.2<sup>4</sup>. For *hūtamān*, *devahūtamān ity ukhāyām juhoti* (v.5.3<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit the last word): it is found again, in like form, in the succeeding division of the section. The specification “before any vowel belonging to the text (*ārshe*, ‘coming from the *rshis*’),” is declared to be meant as an annulment of the restriction, “except before *iti*,” made in the preceding rule. And, to show that the *n* remains unchanged before a vowel not forming part of the fundamental text, is given the *pada*-reading *devahūta-mān iti deva-hūtamān*. There is added further a remark which looks like a gloss that has worked its way into the text: “the specification ‘before what comes from the *rshis*’ has force in both directions, after the fashion of the crow’s eye [Molesworth says, the crow is regarded as having a single eye, which shifts from one eye-

---

*pare<sup>11</sup> yatvam apadyate<sup>12</sup> : dev----: ārsha iti kim: dev----:*  
*<sup>13</sup> ārshagrahanasāmarthyād itiparative<sup>14</sup> 'pi<sup>15</sup> yatvam bhavati: ārsha iti kdkākshivad<sup>16</sup> ubhayatra sambadhyate grahokhyādima-hānparyantam<sup>17</sup> : ārshasvayampātha<sup>18</sup> ity arthah. cikit----: idāv----: kak----: viṣ----: idākakshibhāne<sup>19</sup> 'ti kim: ras----: sam----: hi 'ti kim: ārj----: ārsha itiparativād dev----itivad yatvapraptir higrahanena nishidhyate<sup>20</sup>: stuto----: suvid----: amit----: arāñ----: posh----: agne----:*

<sup>1</sup> For *asomapúrvah*, G. M. read *ity esha nakāras somapúrvō 'nusvāran nā* “*pad-*  
*yate*; B. O. *na som-*, as do T. G. M. in the rule itself. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. *eshu*. <sup>3</sup> G. M.  
*yatvam bhajate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. *ayam*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *vidhān*. <sup>6</sup> W. *sarvo 'rtho*. <sup>7</sup> W. B.  
*iti*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *dvitīvan*. <sup>9</sup> W. O. *avimāddhv*. <sup>10</sup> W. adds *cikitvān*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. O.  
*ārshasvaraparo*. <sup>12</sup> W. *nājadyate*; B. *bhavati*; G. M. O. *bhajate*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*.  
<sup>14</sup> G. M. *pare*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. ins. *hūtamān ity ukhāyām ity atra*. <sup>16</sup> W. O. *kāksh-*; G.  
*M.-kshinyāyena*. <sup>17</sup> W. B. om. *māhān*. <sup>18</sup> B. *ārshāḥ sv-*; G. M. *ārshabhbāvān*.  
<sup>19</sup> G. M. *idādiviśeṣheṇa*. <sup>20</sup> G. M. O. *pratish-*.

The implication here, the commentator tells us, is of a *n* preceded by *ā* only: he does not explain why, but would have a right to appeal to the mention of *ān* last in rule 20, and the exclusion of any other cases than those of a final *dn* in rule 21. His examples are as follows. For *indro me, sapatnāñ indro me* (i.1.13<sup>1</sup>; 6.4<sup>2</sup>: iv.6.3<sup>4</sup>); with a counter-example, *yushmāñ indro 'vrṇita* (i.1.5<sup>1</sup>), to illustrate the need of specifying *me*. For *akah, nigrābhēñā 'dharāñ akah* (i.1.13<sup>1</sup>; 6.4<sup>2</sup>: iv.6.3<sup>4</sup>: that is to say, in the same passage as the preceding: O. omits the first word). For *ūdhvam, yāyāñ devāñ ūdhvam* (i.3.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the first word). For *ihā, agne devāñ ihā* " *vaha* (i.3.14<sup>8</sup>; 5.5<sup>3</sup>: iv.6.1<sup>8</sup>); with a counter-example, *yajñiyāñ iha yāñ havdmake* (i.5.10<sup>3</sup>: only W. has the last word), to show that the *nimitta* in this case is *ihā*, not *iha*. For *apy etu, gharmo devāñ apy etu* (i.5.10<sup>4</sup>: B. omits *gharmah*: again at i.6.8<sup>2</sup>); with the counter-example, *vidvāñ api janyeshu* (vi.1.6<sup>6</sup>), to show that *api* without *etu* does not cause the conversion. For *aganma, suvar devāñ agamma* (i.7.9<sup>2</sup>). For *īdenyāñ, idāmahā devāñ īdenyāñ* (ii.5.9<sup>6</sup>). For *āyajishṭhah, devāñ āyajishṭhah svasti* (iv.3.13<sup>1</sup>; 6.1<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word). For *ā ca, devāñ ā ca vakshat* (iv.6.3<sup>4</sup> twice, and v.4.6<sup>6</sup> twice); but this example is omitted by G. M., and they also omit the item *ā ca* in the rule itself. A counter-example, *yāñ ā vaha uçataḥ* (i.4.44<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), is given by all but O.: in G. M., it should show that *ā* causes *ān* only when followed by *yajishṭhah*; in W., only by *yajishṭhah* and *ca*; but W. states the occasion for it in the same manner as G. M., and B. alone sets it in its proper relation to both the foregoing examples. For *ṛtu*, the example is, in W. B., *vājo devāñ rtubhiḥ* (iv.7.12<sup>2</sup>), but G. M. O. give instead *yebhir devāñ rtubhiḥ* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>): I have found no other case. For *akurvata, vittvā kāmāñ akurvata* (i.5.9<sup>3</sup>). For *aduhat, yajño 'surāñ aduhat* (i.7.1<sup>1</sup>). For *aditiḥ, vivasvāñ aditiḥ* (i.5.3<sup>3</sup>). For *agre, agnis tāñ agre* (iii.1.4<sup>2</sup>): we have also *vāyus tāñ agre* in the same division. For *adharāñ, anyāñ adharāñ sapatnāñ* (iii.2.8<sup>6</sup>); with a counter-example, *bhrātrvyañ adharāñ pādayāmi* (iii.5.3<sup>1</sup>). For *alam, purodācāñ alāñ kurv iti* (vi.3.1<sup>2</sup>). Finally, to show that the rule applies only to *ān*, *paridhīn akurvata* (vi.2.1<sup>5-6</sup>).

The comment closes with an exposition which I must confess that I do not fully understand. It is evidently intended to determine the readings which the words treated in these rules shall have in *jatā*-text; and it furnishes abundant illustrations, in reference to the form of which, however, there is not a little difference between the different recensions: G. M. O. generally citing the passage first

---

*yajñ----: ghar----: etv iti kim: vidvān----: suvar----: īdā----: devāñ----: \*devāñ----: \*yajishṭhaç ce'ti kim: yāñ ----: vājo----: vit----: yajño----: vivas----: agnis----: anyāñ----: sapatnāñ iti kim: bhrā----: puro----: anvādeçah kimarthah: pari----: tattatpadagrāhane kartavye parapadragrahanam \*andrshe 'pi<sup>5</sup> saṁhitāvidhāv<sup>6</sup> agrahañasya<sup>7</sup> ca<sup>8</sup> ya-*

out by means of the quotation of the following word *adharān* (which is itself, therefore, *nāmittika*, while *adharān* is *grahana*; or which is *grahanāndimittika*, ‘undergoing a prescribed effect under the influence of a quoted word’), and which one might suppose changeable only before that word. It is in accordance with this latter explanation that the last two pairs of examples are taken, the one from under rule 21, the other from under rule 22. At any rate, the general conclusion appears to be pretty well assured, that a word which shows a final *ñ* in *samhitā* shows it also in *jatā* before a following vowel of whatever kind. This is markedly different from its treatment in *pada*, where, by the initial specification of rule 20, its power of conversion to *ñ* is lost altogether: and even in *jatā* (as was shown in the note to iii.1), an altered letter usually exhibits its *samhitā* form only under the specific circumstances which condition that form in *samhitā*-text.

न रश्मीञ्ज्वपयान्यमान्पतङ्गात्समानानर्चान्यजीवान्॥२३॥

23. The *n* of *raçmīn*, *grapayān*, *yamān*, *pataṅgān*, *samā-nān*, *arcān*, *yajīyān* remains unchanged.

All these are words occurring in the passages respecting which the comprehensive prescription of rule 20 was made; needing, therefore, to be specifically exempted from its action. The commentator quotes the phrases in which they occur, as follows: *purutrā ca raçmīn anu* (iv.1.2<sup>3</sup>), *aditiḥ grapayān iti* (iv.1.5<sup>4</sup>), *suya-mān utaye* (iv.7.15<sup>4,5</sup>), *pataṅgān asamditah* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>), *samand samānān ucann agne* (iv.3.13<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the first word), *arcān indra grāvānah* (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>: G. M. have dropped out all but *arcā*), and *yajīyān upasthe mātuh* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word). The first two are from *ukhya* passages, the third from a *prshthyā*, the rest from *yājyā*—as is noted also by the commentator (but G. M. omit these notices, save the first). Under the second, he further suggests the objection that, as the word following *grapayān* is *iti*, the case might seem not to fall under the rule (since this expressly says “except before *iti*”); but he urges in reply that the word *ārshe* in rule 21 (that is to say, of course, according to his

23. <sup>1</sup>----- *eteshu<sup>1</sup> grahaneshu nakurāḥ svaraparo 'pi na khalu rephān yakāram<sup>2</sup> vā bhajate. yathā<sup>3</sup>: puru-----: adi-----: ukhyatvdd anayoh prāptih<sup>4</sup>. nān<sup>5</sup> adi----- asye<sup>6</sup> 'tiparatvdd eva nishedhe sati grahanam anartham<sup>7</sup>: iti cet: ārsha itiparatvāt<sup>8</sup> punah prāptih: tan mā bhād iti brāmah. suy-----: <sup>9</sup>prshthyatvāt prāptih<sup>8</sup> patañ-----: <sup>10</sup>yājyātvāt<sup>10</sup> prāptih<sup>9</sup> sama-----: arcān-----: yajī-----: <sup>11</sup>eshām api sāi 'va prāptih.<sup>11</sup>*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *raçmīn ity adishu*; O. *eshu* for *eteshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *vā yatvam*. <sup>3</sup> B. *tathā*; the rest om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *ptinishedhah*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *atra*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. *-thakam*. <sup>7</sup> O. om. *iti*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> O. ins. *asya*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. om.

treatment; and it appears to be laid down that any word has in that text the same form as under analogous circumstances in *samhitā*, whether it fall under an exception or under a rule. Then, as example of an exceptional word, is given, as established by the present precept, *amitrān ud ud amitrān amitrān ut* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>), *amitrān* retaining its *n* throughout; and again, as examples falling under the more general rule, *so asmāñ asmāñ sa so asmāñ: asmāñ avahāyā 'vahāyā 'smāñ asmāñ avahāyā* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>: under rule 21).

So far, now, as I have been able to discover, the teachings of the Prātiçākhya in rules 20–24 of this chapter precisely correspond with the conditions of the known Tāittirīya text: I have not found in the latter a single case of final *āñ*, *iñr*, *uñr* which they do not duly notice, nor an exception to the more general rules which is not provided for. Of course, my observation is more to be trusted upon the former point than upon the latter.

The *sandhi* here treated of is comparatively unusual in our *Sanhitā*, as it is in those of the other Vedas. According to my count, there are (including repetitions) 115 cases of *āñ* (including also one at iv.6.6<sup>7</sup>, omitted above), 5 of *iñr*, and 4 of *uñr*—in all, 124; while, of final *āñ* remaining unchanged before a vowel, I have noted down over 450 instances (and probably not without overlooking a score or two), of *ān*, about 150, of *in*, 16, and of *un*, 4—in all, about 620, or not less than five times as many. The numerical relation in the Atharva-Veda is probably nearly the same. See the end of the note to Ath. Pr. ii.27.

## CHAPTER X.

CONTENTS: 1–9, combination of final and initial similar vowels, and of final *a* or *ā* with initial vowels and diphthongs; 10–12, resulting accentuation and nasalization; 13, special cases of uncombinable final *ā*; 14, of elision of final *a*, *ā* before initial *e* and *o*; 15–17, combination of final *i* and *u* vowels, and resulting accentuation; 18, special cases of uncombinable final *i*; 19–23, elision of final *y* and *v*; 24–25, uncombinable final vowels.

### अथेकम्भे ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for the coalescence of two vowels into one.

An introductory heading to the whole chapter. The commentator paraphrases: “both syllables become one form, of the same kind.”

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: ubhe akshare ekam rāpam sajātīyam<sup>1</sup> dpadyete<sup>2</sup> ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttarām yad vakshyāmāh.*

<sup>1</sup> O. puts before *rāpam*. <sup>2</sup> MSS. -*yata*.

*ti* (ii.5.5<sup>3</sup>: W. reads *neshṭu*); and O. alone adds *mahendrāya* (v.5.21; p. *mahā-indrāya*).

### उवार्णपर श्रोकारम् ॥५॥

5. When an *u*-vowel follows, the product is *o*.

The commentator's single illustrative example is *ishe tvō "rje tvā* (i.1.1).

### एकारैकारपर एकारम् ॥६॥

6. When *e* or *ai* follows, the product is *ai*.

The examples are *sam brahmaṇḍ pṛcyasvāi 'kataḍya svāhā* (i.1.8: O. omits the last word), and *somañindrā babbhulalāñdrā* (v.6.15; p. *soma-ñindrāh*).

The commentator again very elaborately explains *ekārāikārapare* as a *karmadhāraya* compound, formed upon *ekārāikāra* as a *dvandva*; and remarks that the same explanation applies also in the following rule.

### श्रोकारैकारपर श्रोकारम् ॥७॥

7. When *o* or *āu* follows, the product is *āu*.

The examples are *brahmāudanam pacati* (not found in the Tait-

4. *avarṇapūrva iavarṇapare ca sati<sup>1</sup> te<sup>2</sup> ubhe akshare ekāram āpnutaḥ. ne 'sh----: mah. iavarṇaç cā 'śū 'paraç ce 'varṇa-paraḥ<sup>3</sup> : tasmin.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ubhe akshare.* <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. *pūrvaç ca avarṇapūrvaç.*

5. *avarṇapūrva uvarṇapare ca sati te<sup>1</sup> ubhe akshare<sup>2</sup> okāram āpnutaḥ. ishe----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>2</sup> O. om.

6. *avarṇapūrva ekārāikārapare ca sati te<sup>1</sup> ubhe akshare<sup>2</sup> pūr-vāparībhāte<sup>3</sup> āikāram āpnutaḥ. sam----: som----. ekārāraç cāi<sup>4</sup> 'kāraç cāi 'kārāikārāu: tayoḥ samāhāra ekārāikāram. 'sam-āhāre dvandvāḥ<sup>5</sup> tac ca tatparam cāi 'kārāikāraparam karma-dhārayah: tasminn ekārāikārapare<sup>6</sup>. evam<sup>7</sup> uparitanē 'pi sūtre samāsah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *pūrvāpare*, and put before *akshare.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> O. -*tanaśūtre 'pi.*

7. *avarṇapūrva okārāukārapare ca sati te<sup>1</sup> ubhe akshare<sup>2</sup> āukā-ram āpnutaḥ. brah----: dām----<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. add *uktas samāsah.*

## उदात्मुदात्वति ॥ १० ॥

10. When an acute enters into the combination, the result is acute.

That is to say, as the commentator points out, when the first constituent, or the second constituent, or both constituents, have the *uddatta* accent, their combination is *uddatta*. He gives a long list of examples in illustration of the working of the rule, promising that they shall exhibit the whole series of vowel-combinations just prescribed, from the second rule to the ninth, with all possible conditions of accentual combination. Thus, *savitâ' prâ' rpayati* (i.1.1; p. *prâ:* *arp:* W. reads -*yati*) *brâhma yachâ' pâ' gne* (i.1.7<sup>1</sup>; p. *yacha;* *âpa*), *yâjyâ'i'* *'vâ'i' nam* (ii.3.5<sup>2</sup>; p. *yâjyâ': d': evâ:* *enam*: the pada-manuscripts have é 'ti for á'; and so with the other prepositions), *pûshâ'* *'dhatta* (i.5.1<sup>2</sup>; p. *pûshâ': d': adhatta:* W. B. read -*tte*), *divî' va cákshuh* (i.3.6<sup>2</sup> and iv.2.9<sup>4</sup>; p. *divî:* *iva:* for this accent, which is opposed to the teachings of all the other Prâtiçâkhyas, see under rule 17 of the present chapter), *adyâ vâsu vasati'* *'ti' 'ndro hî devâ'ndâm* (ii.5.3<sup>7</sup>; p. *vasati:* *úti:* *indrâh:* O. reads at the end 'ndram *eva*, which I do not find anywhere in the Sanhitâ), *mâitrâvarunî' ty âha* (ii.6.7<sup>4</sup>; p. *-ni:* *úti*). The question is then raised, whether the word *sûnniyam* (vi.2.4<sup>1</sup>) does not fall under this rule, since it exhibits a coalescence into one syllable of two vowels, whereof one is acute; but the reply is made, that a special rule in a later part of the chapter (r. 17) prescribes for it the circumflex. The examples are continued: *rêto dadhâtu'* *'t sakthyôh* (vii.4.19<sup>1</sup>; p. *dadhâtu:* *út*), *vânapâtayô' nû' tish-thanti tâ'n* (vii.4.8<sup>3</sup>; p. *ánu:* *út:* only G. M. have *tân*), and *tâ' dikshâ' pâ' dadhata* (v.5.5<sup>4</sup>; p. *dikshâ:* *úpa:* G. M. omit *tâ*). So many are examples of the combination of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel: the rest illustrate the cases of coalescence in which a or á precedes. They are *sé' mâ'm no havyâdâ-*

---

*ca sati te' ubhe akshare' ãram iti vikâram ãpnutah. upâ-----: rt----- avarñântopasargavîcешanena' kim: vyr----- upasargag cå' sdu pûrvag co' pasargapûrvah: tasminn' upasargapûrve<sup>8</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. *anu.* <sup>2</sup> W. *vîceshâvar;* B. *vîceshokta yaîhâ;* G. M. *avîceshokto* *'pi;* O. *avîceshâktâ api.* <sup>3</sup> O. om. *ayam.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. *upas;* G. M. B. -*sheṇa.* <sup>7</sup> B. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om.

10. *uddattadharmavíciṣṭhe varne pûrvataḥ parata ubhayato vâsthite sati te ubhe apy ekâdeśam ãpanne<sup>1</sup> uddattadharmaṅam<sup>2</sup> ãpnutah. uddatto 'syâ' sti' ty udâttavâñ: tasminn udâttavati. samâṅksharam ãrabhya sarvasmâd<sup>3</sup> ekibhâve 'yathâkramam uddat-tanudâttasvaritapûrvâ ubhayor uddite vo<sup>4</sup> 'dâharanâni darcayi-shyâmatâ.* *sav-----: brah-----: yâj-----: pûsh-----: div-----: adya-----: mait----- nanu sûnniyam ity atro 'dâttendî 'kâdece sati kim na syâd ayam vidhih: uddattapûrvâdhibhikâre*

opinion of some authorities that nasal simple vowels, not *pragras*, are nasal; and he states that the present precept has reference to them: if such a nasal vowel, being acute, enters into a combination of the kind above described, the resulting single syllable is nasal. Examples, he says, are those already given. And he adds that the rule is not approved.

I cannot at all believe this to be the true interpretation. The rule seems, on the other hand, to belong to and represent the same view of the nature of a syllable ordinarily regarded as containing *anusvāra*, which appears so unequivocally at xv.1; and to mean that when such a syllable, being looked upon as one containing a nasal vowel, instead of a vowel with succeeding *anusvāra*, enters into combination with another vowel (of course, a preceding one), the result is also nasal. Thus, for example, *yāḥ* with *añcum* would make *yo 'ñcum*; *svāḥā* and *añsābhyaṁ* (vii.3.16<sup>1-2</sup>), *svāḥā 'ñsābhyaṁ*.

## स्वरितानुदात्संनिपाते स्वरितम् ॥१२॥

12. When circumflex and grave are combined, the result is circumflex.

The examples of this accentual result of combination, as given by the commentator, are as follows: *kanyē 'va tunnd̄* (iii.1.11<sup>3</sup>; p. *kanyāः iva*), *chav̄'m chavyāः pā'kṛtāya svāḥā* (v.7.20; p. *chavyāः upa-d'kṛtāya*: G. M. O. omit *svāḥā*), *yājyāः shāः vāः i sap-tāpādā cākvarī* (ii.6.2<sup>6</sup>; p. *yājyāः eshāः*: G. M. O. end with 'shā'), and *ātha kvaः syā havanī'ya iti* (v.7.4<sup>2</sup>; p. *kvaः asyāः*: O. omits the last two words). He then goes on to point out that the word *svarita*, 'circumflex,' being used in the rule without any distinctive sign, we are to understand the "constant" (*nitya*) or "independent" circumflex (see rule xx.2) to be intended. For this alone arises at the time of production of letters and syllables, elements of words; but the other kinds of circumflex arise after the time of origin of words, in connection with the euphonic combination of

11. *a pragrahāḥ samāṇḍaksharāny anunāsikāny<sup>1</sup> eke-shām<sup>2</sup>* (xv.6) *ity ekeshām<sup>3</sup> matam: tān uddigyaḥ 'yam vidhiḥ. tas-minn<sup>4</sup> udāttavat� anunāsike pūrvataḥ parata ubhayato vā sthite saty<sup>5</sup> ubhe<sup>6</sup> akshare anunāsikadharmaṁ ekam āpnutaḥ. uktāny evo 'ddharapāni.*

<sup>1</sup> etad anishtam.

<sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. yeshām; B. eshtām. <sup>5</sup> W. tasminnād. G. M. O. ins. te. <sup>6</sup> B. O. ins. apy. <sup>(1)</sup> G. M. om.; O. ne'dām sūtram ishtam.

12. *svaritānudāttayoh saṁnipāta ekādeṣe saty ubhdv api tāu svaritam āpadyete<sup>1</sup>. yāthā<sup>2</sup>: kan----: chav----: yāj----: atha---- iha svaritasyā<sup>3</sup> 'viçeshena<sup>4</sup> grahanē nityasvarita eva<sup>5</sup> grhyate: tasya svaritasyā<sup>6</sup> vyañjanānām aksharānān ca' padā-*

'*ti sva-dhā* (only W. has *sva-dhā* in the repetition), *prame 'ti pra-mā, prape 'ti prapā* (O. omits the readings of *pramā* and *prapā*). Further, to explain the final specification *ārshe*, 'before a vowel belonging to the text,' W. gives next the *jatā* readings of *svadhā asi* and *prapā asi*, namely *svadhā asy asi svadhā svadhā asi*, and *prapā asy asi prapā prapā asi*; O. has only the former, and substitutes for the latter *dhruvā 'si dharundā* (iv.2.9<sup>1</sup>; 3.7<sup>2</sup>), which would be in place as a counter-example showing that other words than those specified in the rule are not treated as it prescribes before *asi*, but is not introduced as such, and does not make its appearance at all in the other versions; B. also has only the former (reading at the end *svadhā 'si*), and adds *evam ādī*, 'and so on.' G. M. give no *jatā*-readings at all here, but pass directly from the *pada*-readings to the quotations illustrating the remaining words of the rule, namely: *pra budhniyā īrate* (iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>: G. M. omit *pra*); *dhanvan̄ jyā iyam* (iv.6.6<sup>1-2</sup>: only G. M. have the first word); *ā pūshā etvā vasu* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>), with a counter-example, *tam pūshā 'dhatta* (i.5.1<sup>2</sup>), to show that *pūshā* after any other word than *ā* is not uncombinable; and *ā te suparṇā aminanta evādīh* (iii.1.11<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit the first two words, O. the first three). Now the question is asked again, "why is it said, 'when a vowel from the text follows?'" and W. B. O., having settled the point already so far as *dhā, mā*, and *pā* were concerned, reply by quoting the *jatā*-readings of the other four words, each with its successor, thus: *budhniyā īrata īrate budhniyā budhniyā īrate* (but B. reads *budhniye* "rate, and O. *budhnye*" rate, the last time), *jyā iyam iyam jyā jyā iyam* (B. O. again have *jye 'yam* at the end), *pūshā etvā etu pūshā pūshā etu* (B. O. again *pūshāi 'tu* in the third repetition), and *aminanta evādīr evādīr aminantā 'minanta evādīh* (B. O. once more *aminantāi 'vādīh* to close with). G. M., however, who have the application of *ārshe* in the first part of the rule still to illustrate, give us here a most liberal series of extracts from the *jatā*-text: first, for *asi svadhā* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup> or ii.6.4<sup>4</sup>), namely *asi svadhā svadhā asy asi svadhā*; then for *svadhā asi*, as set down above (with *svadhā 'si* at the end, like B.); but it seems a merely accidental coincidence, for in all the other cases the third pair of words reads like the first, with the hiatus); for *iva prapā, iva prapā prapā 've 'va prapā*; for *prapā asi*, as above reported from W.; for *pra budhniyā*; for *budhniyā īrate*, as in W.; for *dhanvan̄ jyā*; for *jyā iyam*, as in W.; for *ā pūshā, ā pūshā pūshā* " " *pūshā*; for *pūshā etu*, as in W.; for *suparṇā aminanta, suparṇā aminantā 'minanta suparṇās suparṇā aminanta*; and for *aminantā evādīh*, as in W. From all this illustration, we seem authorized to draw the inference that the words mentioned in the rule as having

13. *dhā: mā: pā: <sup>1</sup> eteshv<sup>2</sup> antyasvara ārshe<sup>3</sup> pāthe<sup>4</sup> 'siparah: budhniyā : jyā : ā pūshā : aminanta : eteshv<sup>5</sup> antyasvara ārshe<sup>6</sup> svaraparah pūrvavidhim na prāpnōti. yathā<sup>7</sup>: svā----: sah----: dhan----: asipara iti kim: svā----: <sup>8</sup>pra----: pra-*

same two cases were given by him in illustration of the previous rule (see note to i.22). As general counter-examples, to prove the implication of “*ap a-vowel*,” we have *cityoshtahā gitibhrūḥ* (v.6.14), and *cityoshtāya svāhā* (vii.3.17).

### इवर्णीकारौ यवकारौ ॥ १५ ॥

15. An *i*-vowel and *u* become respectively *y* and *v*.

Here, the commentator tells us, the implication “preceded by an *a*-vowel” ceases, but the implication “followed by a vowel” has force—which implication comes all the way from rule 10 of the preceding chapter. The rule says *ukāra*, ‘short *u*,’ instead of *uvarpa*, ‘an *u*-vowel,’ because long *ū* has already (by iv.5) been declared *pragraha*, and protracted *ū* is made uncombinable below (by x.24). The examples are *abhy asthāt* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>), *āty aṣyadma* (i.3.14<sup>3</sup>), and *ā pūshā etv ā vasu* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>).

### उदात्योश्च परो ज्ञुदातः स्वारितम् ॥ १६ ॥

16. And, when they are acute, a following grave becomes circumflex.

The word “and” (*ca*), we are told, brings down from the preceding rule the “*i*-vowel and *u*,” there described as suffering a certain effect. The examples given of the production of this kind of circumflex accent, later (xx.1) described as the *kshāipra*, are *ry evā'i nena pāri dhatte* (v.3.11<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words), and *apsv ḍgne* (iv.2.11<sup>3</sup>). As counter-examples, we have first *nīcā' tām dhakshy atasām* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>) and *mādhv agnā'u juhōti* (ii.3.2<sup>9</sup>), to show that unless the converted vowels are acute, no circumflex appears; and then, to prove that the following vowel must also be grave, *tād yād ṛcy ḍdhy akshárāni* (ii.4.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first word), *sā tv 'ā'i yajeta* (ii.6.6<sup>3</sup> et al.: G. M. omit this whole example), and *īn nv 'ā' úpastīrnam ichānti* (i.6.7<sup>3</sup>):

*sya grahanam bhavati grahanasya ca* (i.22) *iti vacanāt: upay-*  
....: *nir*.... ‘*avarño lupyata*’ *iti kim: city-*....: *city*....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*ṇapūrvo*. <sup>2</sup> W. -*tamāñinād*; G. M. -*tamānah*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *avarṇapūrva*.  
(\*) B. -*ṇapārvo l*; O. -*ṇalopa*; G. M. -*ṇapūrva*.

15. *avarṇapūrvaḍhikādro nivṛttah: svaraparāḍhikāras tu var-*  
*tate: atha svaraparo yakāram* (ix.10) *iti pārvāḍhyāye pra-*  
*krāntah. ivarṇokārdū padāntāu<sup>1</sup> svaraparādu yathāśāṅkhyena<sup>2</sup>*  
*yavakārdvā ḍpadyete. abhy----: āty----: ā pū----. dīrgha-*  
*syā pragrahavidhāndt plutasya sañdhinishedhād ukārasya kārot-*  
*taratvām<sup>3</sup> kīrtam: ivarṇokārdū yavakārdvā iti.*

<sup>1</sup> W. puts after the next word. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*khyām*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *vakdr-*

noted about thirty cases in the Taittiriya text (examples, one in each book, are i.3.6<sup>2</sup>: ii.1.3<sup>1</sup>: iii.5.5<sup>2</sup>: iv.1.6<sup>2</sup>: v.1.7<sup>2</sup>: vi.1.1<sup>6</sup>: vii.5.7<sup>4</sup>); the accentuation is throughout acute, as we should expect.

## न श्येति मिथुनी ॥ १८ ॥

### 18. Exceptions are *cyeti* and *mithuni*.

That is to say, these words are exceptions to rule 15—and, being thus exempt from the conversion there prescribed, and there being no other rule requiring their alteration, they remain unchanged, as if they were *pragrasas*. The examples are *gyiditena cyeti akuruta* (v.5.8<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the first word; *cyeti* occurs also in the next division of the same section, though not before a vowel), and *na mithuni abhavan* (v.3.6<sup>2</sup>: B. omits *na*). The latter word is found in two other places—at iii.4.9<sup>1</sup> and vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>—exhibiting the same uncombinable quality; and in the latter place it has been made (at iv.53) the subject of special exception as not a *pragraha*. The *pada*-text, in fact, writes both words as if no peculiar character belonged to them.

## लुप्येते व्रवर्णपूर्वी यवकारौ ॥ १९ ॥

### 19. But *y* and *v* are elided, when preceded by an *a*-vowel.

The word “but” (*tu*) in this rule, the commentator says, annuls the application of the rule to any other *y* and *v* than such as are the products of prescribed euphonic processes, and makes these alone the subjects of its action. As a *y* or *v* can never occur as final except by euphonic conversion, the particle has no very useful office to fill, according to the interpretation. Evidently enough, it is used here, as elsewhere in the treatise where a specific force is sought for it by the comment, simply as indicative of a sudden change of subject.

Vastly the largest class of cases falling under the rule is that in which, by ix.10, a *visarjaniya* has been converted into *y* after *a*, *ā*, *ās* before another vowel than *a*. In illustration of this class, the commentator quotes *āpa undantu* (i.2.1<sup>1</sup>), *dhruvā asmin gopatā* (i.1.1: G. M. O. omit the last word), and *na vicinityā iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>). The next class consists of cases of final *e* and *āi*, converted into *ay* and *āy* by ix.11,14: the examples are *ima evā 'smāi* (ii.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and *āśāmāhā eve 'māu* (vii.5.2<sup>1</sup>). Yet another class embraces the endings in *ān* of which the *n* was turned to *y* (with nasalization of the *ā*, or with *anusvāra* added, by xv.1-3) according to the rules at the end of the last chapter (ix.20-24): the selected example is *martyāñ ḍvivega* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>). But the rule teaches also the

18. *cyeti*: *mithuni*: *ity etayor antyasvaro yathāvihitam<sup>1</sup> ya-*  
*tvaṁ nā "padyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: gyāi-----: na-----*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> W. G. M. O. om.

W. B. omit this example; O. puts it after the other one, and leaves off *durone*), and *ahāv anadatā hate* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup> : O. omits *hate*).

This is rather the most striking example afforded us of the overriding by the commentary of the obvious intent of the Prātiçākhya itself. The usage of the existing Tāittirīya text is on the side of the comment: we have a similar resolution of the final *a* of vocatives into *av*, with retention of the *v*, at i.2.13<sup>2</sup> twice; 4.39; 6.12<sup>3</sup>; ii.2.12<sup>4,8</sup>; 4.12<sup>3</sup>; 6.11<sup>1</sup>; iii.2.10<sup>1</sup>; vi.4.3<sup>3</sup>. Of *av* as result of final *āv* before a vowel, I have failed to collect the examples; but had there been any cases of the omission of the *v*, I think I should not have omitted to observe and note them.

## उकारौकारपरौ लुप्येते माचाकीयस्य ॥ २२ ॥

22. According to Mācākiya, both are omitted when followed by *u* or *o*.

Instead of Mācākiya, the southern manuscripts have, both in the rule and in the commentary, Māyikāya.

All the manuscripts of the commentary declare that “respectively” (*yathāsaṁkhyam*) is to be understood in the rule—that is to say, that it directs us to drop *y* before *u*, and *v* before *o*; but their examples do not support this interpretation, and it is palpably a false one. It is difficult to believe that the rule itself is not corrupted, and that it ought not to read *ukārūdūkāraparo lupyate*, ‘*v* is dropped before *u* or *o*’ (it does not occur in the text before *u*); for, while we can discover no phonetic reason for the omission of *y* before a labial vowel, there is a very obvious difficulty in the utterance of *v* (*w*) before *u* (no real Sanskrit word begins with *vu*, nor can I recall it in the interior of a word except as the rare result of *sandhi*); and, as thus amended, Mācākiya’s view would accord with the accepted doctrine of the Rik Prāt. (ii.9-11), and with one mentioned, though not adopted, by the Vāj. Pr. (iv.125).

The illustrative examples given are in part those which have appeared already, even more than once, under the preceding rules:

21. *sāmnidhyān nishedho labhyate. sāmkṛtyasya mate 'varṇapūrvo vakārō na lupyate: yakāras tu lupyata eve 'ty arthah. 'v ḍy-----: ahāv ----- pūrvadvayamatani vartakas tuçabdah.*

*sūtram idam eve 'śṭam: na tu pūrvadvayam<sup>2</sup> paradvayam<sup>3</sup> ca.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. B. om.; O. puts after the other example. <sup>2</sup> O. pūrvasūtrad-. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om.

22. *yakāravakārāv avarnapūrvāv ukārūdūkārapardu lupyete yathāsaṁkhyam<sup>1</sup> mācākiyasyā<sup>2</sup> "cāryasya mate". āpa-----: yā----- evamparāv iti kim: ta-----: v ḍy----- lupyete iti 'ha punarārambhāv pūrvasūtradvayasthitanaññā<sup>4</sup> sambandhaçañkānirdkaranañrthah<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> O. om.; G. M. after *mate*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *māyikāyasyā*, as in the rule itself. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. *matena*. <sup>4</sup> W. -*tajana*; B. -*tajana*; O. -*tananabha*. <sup>5</sup> O. om. *cañkā*; W. -*tham*.

rule pointing out that it has a bearing so extensive. Only one example is given for each class: *astu his itu abrātām* (vii.1.6<sup>1</sup>), and *te enam abhi* (ii.5.6<sup>5</sup>).

The commentator points out, as he did not take the trouble to do under rule 18 of this chapter, that, the rules of combination being thus suspended with reference to these two classes, and no other rule being given about them, they remain in their natural condition.

All the Prātiçākhyas have rules equivalent to this (Rik Pr. ii.27; Vāj. Pr. iv.84; Ath. Pr. iii.33: in the note to Ath. Pr. i.73 I overlooked the present precept of the Tāittirīya-Prātiçākhyā); none assumes that the pronouncing a vowel to be *pragraha* exempts it, *eo ipso*, from phonetic combination.

## परश्च परश्च ॥२५॥

### 25. Also the remaining vowel.

That is to say, the vowel remaining after the omission of the final *y* or *v* is, like those mentioned in the preceding rule, exempt from farther combination. According to the commentator, the “also” (*ca*) of the rule brings forward “*y* and *v*,” the fact of their constituting an exception is inferred from the neighborhood of the preceding rule, and *parah* means ‘another,’ and qualifies *sāmādhīḥ* understood: “no further combination takes place.” This seems to me inadmissible, as there has been no suggestion of any such word as *sāmādhī*. Perhaps *para* may be better understood of the vowel “following” the *y* and *v* of which the chapter has been treating. It needs, at any rate, some violence to bring in the rule with the meaning which it is evidently intended to bear: no one would have any right to guess, from its form and position alone, at what it is aimed.

The commentator’s examples are *apā undantu* (i.2.1<sup>1</sup>) and *agra imam* (i.1.5<sup>1</sup>). In reply to the objection that it would be enough to state the implication of the rule as “where an omission has taken place” instead of “an omission of *y* or *v*,” he brings up *se 'd u hotā* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>), *sāi 'nā 'nīkena* (iv.3.13<sup>2</sup> et al.), and *sāu 'shādhīḥ* (iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>), as examples of an elision of a final which does not prevent the further combination of its predecessor and its successor under the rules of this chapter.

25. *cakārākrṣṭayor yavakārāyor lope sati parah 'sāmādhīḥ na bhavati.*<sup>1</sup> *yathāः apā----: agra---- sāmnidhyān nishedho labhyate. nanu lope sati 'ty<sup>3</sup> etāvatādi 'vā 'lam: yavakārāyor iti kim. se 'd----: 'sāi----: sāu----: ity ādi.*

*iti trībhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarane<sup>6</sup>  
dagamo 'dhyāyah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *sāmādhīḥ* *na bhājate.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. om. *iti.* <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> O. adds *prāthama-prāgṛṇe*.

To illustrate the rule, only two phrases, both of frequent occurrence, are quoted: namely *te 'bruvan* (ii.5.1<sup>2</sup> et al.) and *so 'bravīt* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.).

In the other Prātiçākhyas, the apparent loss of initial *a* after *e* or *o* is treated as an absorption of it into its predecessor, or a unification of the two. See Ath. Pr. iii.53 and note, and rule 19 of this chapter, where a somewhat similar view seems suggested.

All the MSS. excepting B. read in the rule *ekārāokārapūrvah*; and, where the rule is quoted (i.61 and ix.13), we have six cases of this reading against three of *ekārduk-*. But the former is simply an instance of the usage, so common in the commentary (see above, p. 4), of separating, for the sake of clearness, the elements of compound words, or otherwise disregarding the rules of *sandhi*.

### अथातोपः ॥ २ ॥

#### 2. Now follow cases of non-elision.

The rest of this chapter is occupied with an enumeration of the cases in which initial *a* is retained. First, in rule 3, a number of passages are specified in which non-elision is the rule, and elision (as determined by the rules of the next chapter) is exceptional; then, in the following rules, more isolated cases are disposed of.

धातारातिस्तुपवाजपेयजुष्टश्येनायोव्यध्रुवक्षितिरियमेव-  
सायाग्निमूर्धारुद्धप्रथमोपोत्तमविकर्षविहृव्यहिरएयवणी-  
ययाऽयामहापृष्ठे ॥ ३ ॥

3. The *a* is not elided in the following sections: those beginning with *dhātā rātiḥ* and *upa*; those styled *vājapeya*; those beginning with *jush'a* and *cyenāya*; those styled *ukhya*; those beginning with *dhruvakshitiḥ*, *iyam eva sā yā*, and *agnir mūrdhā*; the first and the next to the last of the *rudra* chapter; and those styled *vikarsha*, *vihavya*, *hiranyavarṇīya*, *yājyā*, and *mahāpr-shīhya*.

Here are pointed out not less than seventy-three sections or *anuvākas*, in which *a* is not elided (except in the cases specified in the rules of the next chapter). Those designated by the annotation of their first words are i.4.44; 5.5: jii.1.10; 2.8: iv.3.4,11; 4.4. The *vājapeya* sections are six, namely i.7.7–12. The *ukhya* sections (as pointed out above, under ix.20) are twenty, namely iv.1.1–10; 2.1–10. The *rudra* chapter is iv.5, containing eleven sections;

<sup>1</sup> 2. 'athe 'ty ayam adhikārah.<sup>1</sup> alopa ucyata ity etad adhikrtam  
veditavyam ita uttarāni yad vakshyāmaḥ. <sup>2</sup>na lopo 'lopah.<sup>2</sup> lopā-  
bhāva ity arthaḥ.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om: <sup>2</sup> all MSS. *na lopah alopaḥ*.

quotation of the beginning of the one *anuvâka* has any right, or can have been intended, to include the other. The right of i.4.33, it may be remarked, to stand in the text to which our Prâtiçâkhyâ applies, is assured by the contemplation of others of its phonetic phenomena by rules found elsewhere (most unequivocally by vi.5); its case of non-elision would seem to have been overlooked by the makers of the treatise, but discovered by the commentators, some of whom have tried to force it violently within the ken of their rules. It is necessary to quote iv.4.4 by two words, because i.6.3 also begins with *agnih*, and in it we find *yo me 'nti dûre 'râtîyatî* (i.6.3<sup>1</sup>: the example is wanting in G. M.). Finally, instead of *prshthya* passages, the *mahâprshthya* are specified, because of such cases as *prthivî te 'ntarikshena* (v.2.12<sup>2</sup>: the *anuvâka* is *prshthya*, but not *mahâprshthya*).

The commentator cites one or more examples from each of the sections or sets of sections which the rule specifies, as follows. From the section beginning *dhâtû râtih* is taken *nidhipatir no agnih* (i.4.44<sup>1</sup>); it contains three more cases, and one exception. From that beginning with *upa* comes *âre asme ca* (i.5.5<sup>1</sup>); it contains six other cases, and one exception. From the *vâjapeya* sections, *te no arvantaḥ* (i.7.8<sup>2</sup>) and *te agre açvam â 'yuñjan* (i.7.7<sup>2</sup>); they contain eleven examples, and eleven exceptions. The section beginning with *jushta* yields *yas te añçuh* (iii.1.10<sup>1</sup>), and O. alone adds *yo drapso añçuh* (iii.1.10<sup>1</sup>); there are two other cases, and no exception. From the *gyendya* section, *namah pitrâbhyo abhi* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>) and *viçve arapô edhute* (iii.2.8<sup>4</sup>); there are four other cases, and two exceptions. From the *ukhya* sections, *grñvanti viçve amritasya putrâh* (iv.1.1<sup>2</sup>: only W. has *putrâh*) and *namo astu sarpebhyah* (iv.2.8<sup>3</sup>); they yield seventy-five cases, and forty-five exceptions. From the section *dhruvakshithîh* are cited the only two examples, *viçve abhi grñantu* (iv.3.4<sup>2</sup>) and *ârmir drapso apâm asi* (iv.3.4<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have *asi*); there are no exceptions. From the section beginning *iyam* etc. are taken *ketum kñvâne ajare* (iv.3.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *ketum*) and *trayo gharmdso anu* (iv.3.11<sup>1</sup>); there are three other cases, and one exception. The

---

*ketum....: trayo....: iyam ity <sup>16</sup>etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam: <sup>16</sup> iyan  
te çukra tanûr (i.2.4) ity <sup>17</sup>atra sag.... ity atra mā bhûd iti:  
sâ ye 'ti padadvayam <sup>17</sup> mandadhiydm pratipattyartham iti keci:  
anye tv anyathâ kathayunti: asyâ 'nuvâkasya çeshabkhûta <sup>18</sup> ya  
rg <sup>18</sup> anyatra 'sthitâ sâ 'pi <sup>19</sup>svîkurtavye 'ti<sup>19</sup>: o te.... agnir  
mûrdhâ <sup>20</sup>diva (iv.4.4) ity atra yathâ<sup>20</sup>: sa....: enâ....:  
mûrdhe 'ti kin: agnir mâ durishṭâd (i.6.3) ity atra <sup>21</sup>yo me  
.... <sup>21</sup> rudrapraçnasya prathamopattamânuvdkayor yathâ<sup>22</sup>:  
namo....: drâpe....: uta....: uttamasya pûrvatah <sup>23</sup> samni-  
krshtha upottamaḥ. açmann ârjam (iv.6.1) <sup>24</sup>ity atra 'nuvâka-  
pañcasya<sup>24</sup> vikarshasamjñâ: tacra<sup>25</sup> 'nyâin....: pâvako....  
vâjo nah sampa pradiçga<sup>26</sup> (iv.7.12) ity atra<sup>27</sup> "dyanuvâkatra-*

अश्वसोऽहृतिरनिष्टोऽवन्त्वस्मानवद्यादहनि च ॥४॥

4. Also in *añhasah*, *añhatih*, *anishṛtaḥ*, *avantu* *asmān*, *avadyāt*, and *ahani*.

The cases of non-elision referred to are as follows: for *añhasah*, *pramuñcanto no añhasah* (iv.3.13<sup>5</sup>); for *añhatih*, *pari dveshaso añhatih* (ii.6.11<sup>2</sup>); for *anishṛtaḥ*, *vardhatām te anishṛtaḥ* (iv.1.7<sup>2</sup>); for *avantu* *asmān*, *te avantu* *asmān* (ii.6.12<sup>3</sup>), with a counter-example, *te no vantu pitaro haveshu* (ii.6.12<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *haveshu*), to prove the necessity of giving *asmān* along with *avantu* in the rule; for *avadyāt*, *mitramaho avadyāt* (i.2.14<sup>6</sup>); and for *ahani*, *gucih gukre ahany ojasinā* (iv.4.12<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. stop at *ahani*). All of them occur in passages which are the subject of the preceding rule, and the commentator points out, that the “also” (*ca*) of the rule brings forward the implication of those passages, and that to any of the words specified, if occurring elsewhere in the text, the rule does not apply; citing as example *sa evāi 'nam pāp-mano 'ñhaso muñicati* (ii.2.7<sup>4</sup>: all but G. M. stop at *añhasah*). At first sight, then, the rule appears to be a superfluous repetition of part of the cases involved in the preceding one; in fact, however, its value is that of a rehearsal of exceptions under rule xii.4, which teaches that even in the sections above specified, an *a* before a *y*, *v*, *n*, or *h*, if those letters be followed by a vowel, is elided. The only thing calling for explanation about the matter is the connection in which the counter-exceptions are given, which is, to say the least, quite peculiar.

अनु धर्मासापोमर्तीरथस्त्वोदत्तेवातःपूर्वः ॥५॥

5. Also in *anu*, when preceded by *gharmásah*, *ápaḥ*, *martaḥ*, *rathaḥ*, *tvāḥ*, *datte*, and *vātāḥ*.

This rule belongs, in part, in the same category with the preceding, as pointing out cases in which the *a* of *anu* is retained according to rule 3 of this chapter, notwithstanding the prohibition of rule xii.4; but in part it is of a more general character, since the last two cases lie outside the sections specified in rule 3.

4. <sup>1</sup> *cakāro dhātārātir* (xi.3) *ityādivishayānvādeacakāḥ*<sup>2</sup>: *añhasah*. . . . . *ity eteshu grahañeshu dhātārātirityādisthaleshv*<sup>3</sup> *ekārapūrvo vāv<sup>4</sup>* *'kārapūrvo vā<sup>5</sup>* *'kāro na lupyate. yathā*<sup>6</sup>: *pram-* . . . . *: pari* . . . . *: vardh-* . . . . *: te* . . . . *: asmān iti kim*: *te no* . . . . *: mitr-* . . . . *: guciḥ* . . . . *yavañahaparatvād*<sup>7</sup> (xii.4) *eshu prāpyamāpalopeshv*<sup>8</sup> *alopo 'yam<sup>9</sup> vihitāḥ. anvādegaḥ* *kimarthāḥ*: *sa* . . . .

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *eteshu grahañeshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-disthalavish-*. <sup>3</sup> B. adds *antarvartishu*; G. M. *-lāpattishu*; O. *-lavartishu satsu*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. *vā*. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>7</sup> W. *-ratv*; G. M. *-hasvarapar-*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. ins. *satsu*. <sup>9</sup> W. om.; B. *na*.

7. Also (after *apah*) in *anu* and *agamat*.

Here, again, the *ca*, ‘also,’ brings forward only the last word in the preceding rule, namely *apah*—and what is more, gives that word a new character, changing it from *nimittin* to *nimitta* or affecting cause. Of this the commentator takes no notice, and we are doubtless to regard it as quite in order, and as merely adding another to the formidable list of uncertainties involved in the curious system of *anuvṛtti* or continued implication. The passages had in view are *apo anv acārisham* (i.4.45<sup>3</sup>,46<sup>2</sup>: B. reads *āpo adyā 'nv*, which is the version of the Rig-Veda, i.23.23) and *apo agamad īdrasya* (vii.4.20); as counter-example, is given *paçavo 'nū 'd īyan* (ii.1.5<sup>1</sup>), to prove the implication of *apah*.

**आपःपूर्वी ज्ञिरपानपादस्मान् ॥ ८ ॥**

8. Also in *adbhiḥ*, *apām napāt*, and *asmān*, when preceded by *āpah*.

The passages are *sam āpo adbhir agmata* (i.1.8), *devir āpo apām napāt* (i.2.3<sup>3</sup>: vi.1.4<sup>9</sup>; 4.3<sup>3</sup>), and *āpo asmān mātaruh cun-dhantu* (i.2.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *cundhantu*). The necessity of specifying *napāt* after *apām* is shown by *vārunīr āpo 'pām ca* (ii.1.9<sup>2</sup>), and the restriction to preceding *āpuḥ* by *so 'smān pātu* (v.5.5<sup>1</sup>).

**रायेसदन्तःपूर्वश्चाकारपरे ॥ ९ ॥**

9. In *asmān*, also, if followed by *a*, when *rāye*, *sah*, and *īndrah* precede.

The *ca*, ‘also,’ again brings down the word last mentioned in the preceding rule. The passages for *sah* and *īndrah* are *mā so asmān avahāya* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>) and *īndro asmān asmin dvitiye* (iii.1.9<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *dvitiye*): and other cases of *asmān* after *sah* are to be found at i.6.6<sup>4</sup> and iii.2.7<sup>2</sup>. As counter-examples, are given *so 'smān pātu* (v.5.5<sup>1</sup>), to show that the *asmān* must be followed by *a*; and *smo 'smān amutra* (vi.6.1<sup>4</sup>: all the MSS. of the commentary have the false reading *so 'smān*; such a phrase would be precisely out of place here as illustration), to show that it is only

7. *apa iti cakāro 'nvādiçati: anu: agamat: ity etayor akāro 'na khalv' apahpūrvo lupyate. apo anv----: apo ag----- evampūrva iti kim: paçavo----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. *khalu*, and put *na* next before *lupyate*.

8. *adbhiḥ----- eteshv<sup>1</sup> akāra āpahpūrvo na lupyate. sam ----: devir----: napād iti kim: vārunīr----: āpo----- evampūrva iti kim: so-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eshv*; O. *eshu grahaneshv*.

and second, to show that these words do so only after *te*, *prathamo* 'ṅgu skanduti' (iii. .8<sup>3</sup>: only B. has *skandati*).

Of *agnē* after *te*, the text presents eighteen other cases: namely i.2.11<sup>2</sup> twice; 4.43<sup>2</sup>; 5.2<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>2</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>; 6.6<sup>2</sup>; 7.6<sup>4</sup>: iii.4.10<sup>5</sup>; 5.3<sup>2</sup> (a second case): v.4.7<sup>5</sup>; 7.4<sup>1</sup>, 6<sup>3</sup>, 8<sup>1</sup> three times: vi.2.2<sup>7</sup>; 6.1<sup>2</sup>.

## मेपूवश्च ॥ ११ ॥

11. In *agnē*, also, when preceded by *me*.

Only *agnē*, the last word of rule 10, is brought down into this. The commentator quotes *yan me agnē asya* (i.8.2<sup>1</sup>, 10<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit *asya*) and *imā me agnā ishṭakāḥ* (iv.4.11<sup>3</sup>, <sup>4</sup> and v.4.2<sup>4</sup>); and there is another case in iv.4.11<sup>4</sup>. He adds, as usual, a number of counter-examples, of obvious intent: they are *tēna tvā* "dadhe 'gne aṅgirah" (i.2.12<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *aṅgirah*), *prāṇaç ca me 'pānah* (iv.7.1<sup>1</sup>), and *tad aṣakām tan me 'rddhi* (i.6.6<sup>3</sup>).

## अस्याश्चिनापरा च ॥ १२ ॥

12. As also, in *asya*, *açvinā*, and *aparā*.

That is to say, when these words follow *me*. The passages are *vivāntu devā havisho me asya* (i.5.10<sup>3</sup>: O. begins at *devā*), *punar me aṣvīndā yuvām cakṣūih* (iii.2.5<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit the last word, O. the last two), and *yad vā me aparāgatam* (vi.6.7<sup>2</sup>).

## नःपूर्वो ऽसदभिरधान्तमोऽभ्यस्मिन्नयपदि ॥ १३ ॥

13. Also in *asat*, *agnih*, *agha*, *antamah*, *abhi*, *asmin*, and *adya pathi*, when preceded by *nah*.

The examples are *supārō no asad vase* (i.2.3<sup>1</sup> and vi.1.4<sup>4</sup>), *ayam no agnir varivah* (i.3.4<sup>1</sup> and i.4.46<sup>3</sup>; there is another case of *no agnih* at v.7.9<sup>1</sup>), *rakshā mākir no aghaçāñśa īcata* (i.4.24 and

10. *adya----- eteshv<sup>1</sup> akāras ta ity evampūrvo na lupyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: paçum-----: upo-----: <sup>3</sup>aṅguṇā-----: <sup>3</sup>yat----- eteshv iti kim: <sup>4</sup>te-----: tepūrva iti kim: prathamo-----<sup>4</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> O. *eshu*. <sup>2</sup> in W. only. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> W. om., and ins *tena tvā* etc.

11. *'cakāro 'gna ity anvādiçati: mepūrvo 'gna ity atrā 'kāro<sup>1</sup> na lupyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: yan-----: imā----- mepūrva iti kim: tena-----: anvādegena<sup>3</sup> kim: 'prāṇaç-----<sup>4</sup> tad-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. *cakārākrṣte saty agna ity asminn akāro ma ity evampūrvo*; G. M. the same, omitting *sati*; O. the same, omitting *sati* and the second *iti*. <sup>2</sup> in W. only. <sup>3</sup> O. -*pa iti*. <sup>4</sup> O. om.

12. *mepūrva iti cakāro 'nvādiçati: asya----- <sup>1</sup> eteshv<sup>2</sup> akāro mepūrvo na lupyate. vi-----: punar-----: yad-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>2</sup> O. *eshv*.

and accordingly—resorting, as we cannot well help saying, to one of his usual subterfuges—he declares *agni* (or, according to W. B. O., *gni*) “a part of a word, intended to include a number of cases occurring in another *gākha*;” not going so far, however, as to quote any of these cases. I suspect *gniparāh* to be either a corruption of *gnih*, or originally intended as equivalent with it.

The passages are *āvinno agnir grhapatih* (i.8.12<sup>2</sup>) and *somo agnir upa devāh* (iii.2.4<sup>1</sup>); and the commentator adds counter-examples, so *gnir jātāh* (v.1.4<sup>1</sup>) and *āvinno 'yam asātū* (i.8.12<sup>2</sup>).

धीरसोऽदब्धासैकादशासक्षषीणांपुत्रःशार्यातेज्ञादःपि-  
तारःपृथिवीयज्ञान्नासतेयेगृह्णाम्यग्रेवाश्वपत्तज्ञेसश्स्फानोयु-  
वयोर्यःपृष्ठेपतिवीर्गोशुभ्मःपुवःसमिद्भूषभःपाथोवचोव-  
र्षिष्टेज्ञापाणोयोरुद्रोवृष्णाःपूर्वः ॥ १६ ॥

16. Also *a* is retained when preceded by *dhirāsah*, *adabdhāsah*, *ekādaçasah*, *rshīñām putrah*, *çāryāte*, *ashādhhah*, *pitārah*, *prthivī yajñe*, *āśate ye*, *grhṇāmy agre*, *vāñ eshah*, *jajñe*, *sañspānāh*, *yuvayor yah*, *prshthe*, *patir vah*, *go*, *çushmah*, *puvah*, *samiddhah*, *rshabhah*, *pāthah*, *vacah*, *varshishthe*, *jushāño*, *yo rudrah*, or *vṛshnah*.

The passages had in view are quoted as follows: *tām dhīrāso anūdr̄gya yajante* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word); *odabdhāso addbhym* (i.1.10<sup>2</sup> and iii.5.6<sup>1</sup>); *ekādaçāso apsushadah* (i.4.11); *rshīñām putro adhīrīja eshah* (i.3.7<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word), with a counter-example, *yasya putro jātāh* (i.5.8<sup>5</sup>; 7.6<sup>5</sup>), to show the need of including *rshīñām* in the *nimitta*; *yathā çāryāte apibah* (i.4.18: G. M. O. omit *yathā*); *ashādho agnih* (i.5.10<sup>1-2</sup>); *twatpitāro agne devāh* (i.5.10<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. omit *devāh*); *prthivī yajñe asmin* (i.6.5<sup>1</sup>), with a counter-example, *te mā 'smīn yajñe* (iii.2.4<sup>1</sup>), where, as only W. B. point out, the *jātā*-text shows the mutilation of *asmin* after *yajñe* not preceded by *prthivī* (thus, *asmin yajñe yajñe 'smīnn asmin yajñe*); *adhyāsate ye antarikshe* (iii.5.4<sup>3</sup>), with *ye prthivyām ye 'ntarikshe* (iv.5.11<sup>2</sup>: only O. has the first *ye*) as counter-example; *mavi grhṇāmy agre agnim* (v.7.9<sup>1-2</sup>), with *ashātū kṛtvo 'gre 'bhi shunoti* (vi.4.5<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *shunoti*) as counter-example; *idāvāñ esho asura* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup> and iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>), with *çukra esho 'nto 'ntam manushyah* (vii.2.7<sup>2</sup>: O. stops at

15. *āvinnah: somah: <sup>1</sup> evampūrvu <sup>2</sup> kāro 'gniparo<sup>2</sup> na lupyate: agni<sup>3</sup> ti padākṣadeçah çākhāntare bahupādānārthah. āvinno ----: somo----. evampūrvu iti kim: so----: evampara iti kim: āvinno----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *agni ity evamparah akāro*; B. *akārah agniparo*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. O. *gni*.

अरतिमस्यजस्यातिद्रुतोऽतिधन्त्यनृणोऽविष्वनमीवो-  
ज्ञेष्वर्चिर्डीतानद्यानिमद्वियाअम्बाल्यर्वतमस्वकृणोद-  
द्विरोऽप्सुयोअस्कभायदच्युतोऽश्वसनिरस्थभिरश्वेदङ्गे-  
ञ्जिय ॥ १७ ॥

17. Also in *aratum*, *asya yajñasya*, *atidrutah*, *ati yanti*, *anṛnah*, *avishyan*, *anamīvah*, *anneshu*, *arcih*, *ajitân*, *ajyânim*, *ahnîyâh*, *ambâli*, *arvantam*, *astu*, *akrnot*, *aṅgirâh*, *apsu yaḥ*, *askabhâyat*, *acyutah*, *açvasanîh*, *asthabhih*, *açicret*, *aṅge*, and *aghniya*.

The passages had in view are quoted by the commentator as follows, with such counter-examples as are needed to justify the inclusion of more than one *pada* in any case: *mûrdhânam dîvo aratum prthivîyâh* (i.4.13 and vi.5.2<sup>1</sup>: O. begins at *divuh*, and it alone has *prthivîyâh*); *yan me agne asya yajñasya* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup>,10<sup>2</sup>), with the counter-example *ete syâ' mushmin* (vi.1.10<sup>5</sup>); *pratyânk somo atidrutah* (i.8.21: all the MSS. here insert the *k* before *somo*, as required by v.32, and G. M. even convert it to *kh*, according to xiv.12); *pacyanto ati yanti* (iii.2.2<sup>1</sup>), and, as counter-example to both these last examples, *nai 'nañ somo 'ti pavate* (vi.5.11<sup>4</sup>: O. begins at *somo*); *tad agne anṛno bhavâmi* (iii.3.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *bhavâmi*); *na yavase avishyan* (iv.4.3<sup>3</sup>); *svâvego anamîvo bhavânah* (iii.4.10<sup>1</sup>: B. O. omit *bhavâ nah*); *ye anneshu vividhyanti* (iv.5.11<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word); *jâtavedo yo arcih* (v.7.8<sup>1</sup>); *carado ajitân* (v.7.2<sup>3</sup>); *teshâm yo ajyânim* (v.7.2<sup>3</sup>); *tiroahnîyâ mā suhutâh* (vii.3.13: O. omits *suhutâh*); *ambe ambâli* (vii.4.19<sup>1,2</sup> twice, <sup>3</sup> twice); *yo arvantam jîghânsati* (vii.4.15: O. omits the last word); *bahis te astu bâl iti* (iii.3.10<sup>2</sup>: O. stops at *astu*; the text furnishes eleven other cases of *astu* with *a* retained, at i.2.3<sup>3</sup>; 4.45<sup>1</sup>; 8.14<sup>2</sup>; iii.1.1<sup>4</sup>; 2.5<sup>7</sup>,8<sup>2</sup>; v.5.9<sup>3</sup> twice; 7.2<sup>4</sup>,4<sup>3,4</sup>); *ita indro*

17. *aratum* ..... <sup>1</sup> *eteshv akâro <sup>2</sup>na khalv<sup>3</sup> ekârapûrva okârapûrvo vâ lupyate. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: mûrdh-* ..... *yan* ..... *yajñasye 'ti kim*: *ete* ..... *pratyân-* ..... *pacy-* ..... *drutoyanti 'ty âbhyâm<sup>5</sup> kim*: *ndi* ..... *tad* ..... *na* ..... *svâv-* ..... *ye* ..... *jâtavedo* ..... *carado* ..... *teshâm* ..... *tiro* ..... *ambe* ..... *yo* ..... *bahis* ..... *ita* ..... *agne* ..... *yo* ..... *ya iti kim*: *agvo* ..... *yo* ..... *madâya* ..... *yo* ..... *sanir iti kim*: *açvebhyo* ..... *indro* ..... *bhir<sup>6</sup> iti kim*: *'cam* ..... *ity atra'* *jaṭâyâm<sup>7</sup>*: *asthabhyo* ..... *varuno* ..... *aṅge* ..... *aghniye* 'ty *akâragrhitâh* *pâdaikadeço bahupâddnârthaḥ*: *etâni* ..... *yad* ..... *payo* .....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. the enumeration, and ins. *iti*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. *khalu*, and put *na* next before *lupyate*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> B. *tabhyâm*; G. M. *etâbhyâm*. <sup>5</sup> B. G. M. *asthabhir*. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> B. om.

words, instead of three, are cited in the repetition. As counter-examples, showing the value of the restriction "when a vowel follows," are given *ug vâ agnih so 'dhvaryum* (v.6.2<sup>4</sup>) and *andho 'dhvaryuh syât* (v.1.3<sup>1</sup> and vi.1.8<sup>3</sup>: O. alone has *syât*, and, without that addition, the phrase is found also at v.1.3<sup>2</sup>). This proves that what is to be "followed by a vowel" is the *r* of *adhvara*; but how that meaning is conveyed by the terms of the rule is not easy to discover. The MSS. are at variance as to the reading of the first word of the rule, T. W. B. O. giving *adhvara*, and G. M. *adhware*, between which I am at a loss to decide confidently, because neither of them appears to be what is wanted. But I prefer *adhvara*, both because it is better supported, and because it is not the usage of the treatise to put in a case-form the words or themes which it cites from the text.

An additional case falling under the rule is *ārdhvo adhvaram* (i.1.12); and yet others (as i.5.5<sup>1</sup> twice, and, doubtless, i.4.46<sup>2-3</sup>), to which it would else apply, are disposed of under the general rule xi.3.

## स पूर्वस्यार्धसदृशमेकेषामर्धसदृशमेकेषाम् ॥ १६ ॥

19. In the opinion of some, it becomes half-similar with its predecessor.

This is a very blind precept, and we are permitted to doubt whether its purport is interpreted aright by the commentary; in which, moreover, there are peculiar and unintelligent variations of reading. What letter is the subject of the rule—the elided *a*, or the non-elided? The comment says the latter (although the majority of MSS. blunderingly say the "non-protracted" instead), and states that it acquires a quantity similar to half a *mora*, or becomes one and a half *moras* long. It is added, that no special examples are given, because such would not bring to light any difference (? only O. has the reading that means this: W. B. omit the "not;" G. M. are unintelligible). This appears to me quite unsatisfactory. The distinct demonstrative *sa* in the rule ought to point back to something distinctly stated above, and that is the

---

19. yo 'yam akâro 'luptah' sa pûrvasyâdi "kârasyâu 'kârasya"<sup>2</sup>  
vâ 'rdhamâtrusadraçanâ<sup>3</sup> kâlam bhajata<sup>4</sup> ity ekeshâm rshînâdâm<sup>5</sup>  
matam<sup>6</sup>: 'adhyardhamâtrah syâd' ity arthaḥ. uktâny evo 'dâha-  
rañâni viçeshâdurganât<sup>8</sup>. ardhena sadraço 'rdhasadrâçah<sup>9</sup>: tam  
ardhasadrâçum<sup>10</sup>.

*iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarana*<sup>11</sup>  
*ekâdaço 'dhyâyah.*<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. B. O. *aplutah*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ekâdraokârapûrvasya*. <sup>3</sup> W. -*trañi sad-*; G. M. -*trásad-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *labhata*. <sup>5</sup> O. *áçaryâñâm*. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> W. O. -*trasyâm*; B. G. M. -*tra syâd*. <sup>8</sup> W. B. -*shadar-*; G. M. *darranât*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *yâh*. <sup>10</sup> O. om. <sup>11</sup> O. ins. *prathamaprañe*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. add *çrikâshnâya namah*.

3. But not when *garbhah*, *samnaddhah*, *yamah*, or *bhadrah* precedes.

The examples quoted by the commentator are *garbho asy oshadhinâm* (iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>), *samnaddho asi vîdayasva* (iv.6.6<sup>5</sup>), *asi yamo usy âdityah* (iv.6.7<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word), and *tvam bhadro asi kratuh* (iv.3.13<sup>1</sup>). There is another case of *usi* after *gurbhah* at iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>, which is then repeated at v.1.5<sup>3</sup>, the *a* standing this time unelided by rule i.61.

As usual, the commentator thinks it necessary to account for the inclusion of the double *pada sam-naddhah*, instead of simply *naddhah*, in the rule. Some, he says, quote as counter-example *upanaddho 'surah* (iv.4.9); but its propriety is questionable, since the passage does not fall under xi.3, and moreover, there is no *asi* in it (O. has the good sense to pass without notice this most absurd suggestion); and the valid counter-example is to be sought in another *câkha*. We have here an unusually clear example of the arbitrary way in which the plea *câkhântare* is resorted to, in order to avoid the attribution of a slight inconsistency to the treatise-makers.

### यवनहृपरः स्वरपरेषु ॥४॥

4. *A* is elided before *y*, *v*, *n*, and *h*, when these are followed by a vowel.

The examples given are *hiranyaçrîgo 'yo asya pâdâl* (iv.6.7<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *pâdâl*), *vunaspate 'va srijâ rârânah* (iv.1.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *rârânah*), *varenyo 'nu prayânam* (iv.1.10<sup>4</sup>), and *jambhayanto 'him vîkam* (i.7.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *vîkam*). These are but specimens selected from among a considerable number of cases: namely, before *y*, two; before *v*, nineteen; before *o*, fourteen (all but three of them, cases of *anu*, the counter-exceptions to which form in part the subject of xi.5); before *h* (which, as the counter-exceptions noted in xi.4 show, includes also *nh*), five; in all, forty. To show the necessity of the restriction "when these are followed by a vowel," are cited *cukram te anyut* (iv.1.11<sup>2</sup>) and *agre ahnâñ hitah* (iv.1.3<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *hitah*).

There is a well-established difference of reading here in the rule itself: T. B. G. M. have *yavanhâ svarupareshu*, only W. and O. adding *para* (which I have amended to *parâh*) after *ha*. So also,

3. *garbhah*.....<sup>1</sup> *evampûrvah* *sâmnidhyâl labdhe 'si*<sup>2</sup> 'ty *asmin grahanे*<sup>3</sup> 'kîro<sup>4</sup> *nu*<sup>5</sup> *hupyate*. *garbho*....: *sa m n u d d h o*....: *'sam iti kim: upan*.... *iti kecid uddharanti: tuc cintyam: dhâtrâtrâtir* (xi.3) *ityâdyantah pâtitvâbhâvâd asiçabdâdarçanâc 'ca: mukhyam tu* *çâkhântare vîñeyam pratyudâharanam*<sup>6</sup>. *asi*....: *tv a m*....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> W. *tasminn asî*. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *ekârapûrva okira-pûrvo vâ*. <sup>5</sup> B. om. <sup>6</sup> O. simply *udiharañan çâkhântare*. <sup>7</sup> W. *ca 'mukhyam kiñtu*.

of a word, so given for the sake of conciseness, and including the two cases *aṅgirasvad* *ache* 'mo 'gnim and *aṅgirasvad bharishyāmo* 'gnim (both iv.1.2<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *aṅgirasvad* in each). The other passages had in view by the rule are *euro* 'gnaye bharatā brhot (iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last two words), *dudhāno* 'gnir hotā (iv.1.3<sup>4</sup>), and *sadhasthe* 'gnim purishyam (iv.1.3<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *purishyam*). To prove the implication of *gn* only, is given *sadhasthe adhy uttarusmin* (iv.6.5<sup>2</sup>; 7.13<sup>4</sup>; v.7.7<sup>2</sup>: O. omits).

By xi.16, *vacah* does not as a general thing elide the following *a*; but there is no clashing between the two rules, as they have reference to different parts of the text.

अभ्यावर्तिनपूपमपिद्याम्यवान्वदितिःशर्मांग्रेनिद्वामग्न-  
यःपप्रयोऽस्माकमस्मेधत्ताश्माश्चुतिरश्यामाभार्यमन्नस्म-  
त्याशानस्मिन्यज्ञे ऽस्ताव्ययमानाभिद्रोहमधाव्यदोऽयोऽदु-  
ग्धाश्चरिष्टाश्चरथाश्चर्चल्पतरस्यामत्रस्यान्नायाङ्गिरस्त्वदकरम्

॥ ७ ॥

7. The *a* is elided in *abhyāvartin*, *apūpam*, *api dadhāmi*, *adyā* 'nu, *aditih* çarma, *agner jihvām*, *agnayāḥ papruyah*, *asmākam*, *asme dhatta*, *aymā*, *ayvā* wherever found, *ayyāma*, *anā*, *aryaman*, *asmatpācān*, *asmīn yajñe*, *astā*, *ayathāmānā*, *abhidroham*, *adhāyi*, *adah*, *atho*, *aduglhāḥ*, *arishṭāḥ*, *arathāḥ*, *arcanti*, *antar usyām*, *atra stha*, *annāya*, *aṅgirasvat*, and *akaram*.

The commentator gives an example for each specification of the rule, with counter-examples for every case in which more than one *pada* is taken, as follows: *ugne* 'bhya vartin (iv.2.1<sup>2</sup>), and, as counter-example, *kāmena kṛto abhy ānad arkam* (i.1.14<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word, O. the last two); *bhadragoce* 'pāpām devu (iv.2.2<sup>3</sup>: only W. has *devu*); *ugne* 'pi *dudhāmy* īsyē (iv.1.10<sup>2</sup>), and, as counter-example, *baddho apikuksha āsanī* (i.7.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word); *unu* no 'dyā 'numatiḥ (iii.3.11<sup>3</sup>: iv.4.12<sup>5</sup>; 7.15<sup>5</sup>), and, as counter-example, *pra tat te adya cipirishta nāma* (ii.2.12<sup>5</sup>: O. ends with *adya*, and G. M. substitute another passage,

6. *gnupura iti eakāro jñāpayati*: *māh----- ity evampārvo*  
*gnaparo* <sup>1</sup>*nudattto* 'py<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>*akāralopo bhanati*<sup>2</sup> *yuthā*<sup>3</sup>: *aṅgi-----*:  
*ma* *ity* <sup>4</sup>*atra pudālikadeçugrahanām*<sup>4</sup> *sāṅkṣhepārtham*: *aṅgi-----*:  
*vaco-----*: *dudhāno-----*: *sadhasthe-----* <sup>5</sup>*anvādegaḥ*  
*kimarthah*<sup>5</sup>: *sadh----- gnaparasyā* 'kārasyā' <sup>6</sup>*nudattārtho* 'yam  
*ārambhaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> in W. only. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. *akuṛo lupyute*. <sup>3</sup> in W. only. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *apadagra-*  
*haṇam*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *anvādegena kim*; O. om., along with the following example.  
<sup>6</sup> in W. only.

'si (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *prasitim*) ; mā suparno 'vyathamānā (iv.2.9<sup>1</sup>) ; Jane 'bhidroham manushyāḥ (iii.4.11<sup>6</sup>: O. omits *manushyāḥ*), with a counter-example, *br̥haspate abhičaster amuñcaḥ* (iv.1.7<sup>4</sup>: only W. has *amuñcaḥ*) ; upa prā 'gāt sumanme 'dhāyi mamma (iv.6.8<sup>3</sup>: all but O. begin at *sum-*, and G. M. end with 'dhāyi) ; ye 'do rocane divāḥ (iv.2.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *divah*) ; mahyam agne 'tho sida (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup>; 2.1<sup>5</sup>) ; cāra nonumo 'dugdāḥ (ii.4.14<sup>2</sup>) ; pūrve 'rishtāḥ syāma (iv.7.14<sup>2</sup>: all the MSS. read -*shtā*) ; ye pavayo 'rathāḥ (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>: only G. M. have *ye*) ; gāyatriṇo 'rcanty arkam (i.6.12<sup>2-3</sup>: only G. M. have *arkan*) ; abhi cācuco 'ntar asyām (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup>; another case at iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>), with the counter-example *rukmo antar vi bhāti* (iv.1.10<sup>4-5</sup> et al.) ; ye 'tra stha purāṇāḥ (iv.2.4<sup>1</sup>), with the counter-example *tvashtā no atra varivāḥ* (i.4.44<sup>1</sup>) ; rāyas posho 'nnāya tvā (i.7.9<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *tvā*) ; pṛthiviyāḥ sadhusthe 'ngirasvat (iv.1.6<sup>1,2</sup> four times; other cases at iv.1.1<sup>3,4</sup> three times) ; and *aham tebhyo karam namah* (iv.5.1<sup>2</sup>).

गाहमानोऽायमानोहेतयोभन्यमानोवनस्पतिभ्यःपते-  
स्विधस्तपसःस्वधावोभासितोऽग्नयआयोऽधर्योक्रतोपूर्वः

॥ ८ ॥

8. An *a* is elided when preceded by *gāhamānah*, *jāyamānah*, *hetayah*, *manyamānah*, *vanaspatibhyah*, *pate*, *sridhāḥ*, *tapasāḥ*, *svadhāvāḥ*, *bhāmituh*, *agnayah*, *āyo*, *adhvaryo*, and *krato*.

The quoted passages are *gāhamāno 'dāyah* (iv.6.4<sup>2</sup>) ; *jāyamāno 'hnām ketuh* (ii.4.14<sup>1</sup>) ; *hetuyo 'nyum asmat* (iv.5.10<sup>5</sup>) ; *manyamāno 'martyam* (i.4.46<sup>1</sup>) ; *vanuspatibhyo 'dhi sambhṛtām* (iv.6.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word), with the counter-example *namah pitṛbhyo abhi* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>) ; *annapute 'nnasya* (iv.2.3<sup>1</sup> and [by i.61] v.2.2<sup>1</sup>) ; *niho ati sridho 'ty acittim* (iv.1.7<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the first two words) ; *tapaso 'dhi jātāḥ* (iv.2.10<sup>4</sup>) ; *devu svadhāyo 'nṛtasya dhāma* (iii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: O. omits the first word and the last), with the counter-example *anyā vo anyām avatu* (iv.2.6<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word) ; *bhāmito 'nitrasyā 'bhidāsataḥ* (i.6.12<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word) ; *yān agnayo 'nvatupyūnta* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *yān*) ; *agne 'dabdhāt yo 'citatano* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *agne*) ; *adhvaryo 'ver apāś* (vi.4.3<sup>4</sup>: O. ends at 'veḥ') ; and *catakrato 'nu te dāyi* (ii.5.12<sup>5</sup>).

A special explanation is required for the passage in which *agnayah* occurs, since the following *pada* is *anu*, which might seem to

---

8. *gāhamānah----- ity evampūrvō<sup>4</sup> 'kāro lupyate. yathā<sup>3</sup>:*  
*gāh-----: jāy-----: hetayo-----: many-----: vanas-----:*  
*vanaspātī 'ti kim: namah : anna-----: niho-----: tapaso*  
*-----: deva-----: svadhe 'ti kim: anyā-----: bhāmito-----:*  
*yān--- : ukārasya vakāravikriyātīm vyañjanaparo nakāru<sup>3</sup> iti*  
*yavanaha (xii.4) nishedhābhāvād alope prāpte tadapavādo*

(i.4.33) already treated of under xi.3 (p. 244), I have found only two cases of *a* retained which are not accounted for: namely *ārdhvo asthāt* (v.2.1<sup>5</sup>; R-V. x.1.1) and *so agnih* (v.2.3<sup>3</sup>; R-V. vii. 1.16); and both these I suspect to fall under i.61, I having failed to note the previous occurrence of the passages. Of cases explained by i.61 there is a considerable number; only, as was remarked under that rule (see p. 47), there are three among them to which, if the commentator's forced interpretation of its terms be admitted, it cannot be made to apply. Of cases of elision of *a* unaccounted for, I have found none. Of course, my examination of the Sanhitā, having been made by the help of a single *samhitā* manuscript, is not to be credited as absolutely accurate: yet I have a good deal of faith in the trustworthiness of its result.

### तस्मिन्ननुदाते पूर्वं उदातः स्वरितम् ॥ १ ॥

9. When the elided *a* is grave, the preceding diphthong, if acute, becomes circumflex.

All the Prātiçākhyas, and the usage of the known Vedic texts, are in accord upon this point (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.55). To the particular circumflex hence resulting, the treatise gives later (xx.4) the name *abhinihata*; the others call it *abhinihita*. The examples given are *tē 'brwan* (ii.5.1<sup>3</sup> et al.) and *sō 'bravīt* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.).

The representation of the tone of the elided *a* in the resulting accent of the eliding diphthong, of course, favors the view that regards it as absorbed into the latter, rather than elided.

### उदाते चानुदात उदातम् ॥ १० ॥

10. When it is acute, the preceding diphthong, if grave, becomes acute.

This, also, is a universal usage. The commentator quotes two examples: *áva rundhaté 'satram vā'i* (vii.3.8<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *ava*) and *ānnapaté 'nnasya* (iv.2.3<sup>1</sup> and v.2.2<sup>1</sup>).

### स्वरितश्च सर्वत्र स्वरितश्च सर्वत्र ॥ ११ ॥

11. As also, in every case, if circumflex.

The commentator explains *ea*, 'also,' as bringing down *udātte*,

9. *yam<sup>1</sup> adhikṛtyd 'yam prubundha uktus tusminn<sup>2</sup> akāre 'nu-dätte lupte suti pūrva ekāra okāro vo 'dāttah<sup>3</sup> svaritam āpadyate. yathā<sup>4</sup>: tē ----: sō -----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ayam*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *asm-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. put next after *pūrva*. <sup>4</sup> in B. only.

10. *tusminn<sup>1</sup> evā 'kāra udātte<sup>2</sup> lupte sati<sup>3</sup> pūrva ekāra okāro vā 'nu-dätta udāttam āpadyate. yathā<sup>4</sup>: ava----: unna----*.

<sup>1</sup> O. *asm-*. <sup>2</sup> O. puts next after *eva*. <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> in O. only.

A general heading, of which, however, the force extends but a very little way (through rule 4). The subject is a supplement to that treated at v.27-31, where we are told what is done with *m* before a mute, or before any other semivowel than *r*.

## रेफोल्पपरः ॥२॥

2. A *m* is omitted, when followed by *r* or a spirant.

This omission of *m* is accompanied, according to xv.1-3, by the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or else the insertion of *anu-svāra* after it. Respecting the relation of these alternative views to one another, see the note to ii.30. The definition of the *m* as lost or omitted accords best with the former view: it is sufficiently logical and consistent to say that the consonant is lost and the vowel nasalized; if, however, an *anusvāru*, as a separate vocal element, is to take the place of *m* after the vowel, the only acceptable form of statement must be that the *m* is directly converted into *anusvāru*. This form of statement is in fact adopted by the Rik (iv.5) and Vāj. (iv.1) Prātiçākhyas, which acknowledge an *anu-svāra*, while the other is rightly preferred by the Ath. Prāt. (ii.32, i.67), which holds the theory of the nasalized vowel: our own treatise, as was pointed out above (p. 68), trims between the two views.

The commentator's examples are *pratyushtūñ rakshah* (i.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), *sañçitam me brahma* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>: v.1.10<sup>2</sup>), *tañ shud uhāni* (v.5.2<sup>6</sup>), *sañ-sam id yuvase vrshan* (ii.6.11<sup>4</sup>: iv.4.4<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *vrshan*), and *tvañ ha yad yavishthya* (ii.6.11<sup>1</sup>). Counter-examples are given: to show that *m* before other letters is not dropped, *idañ vām āsyे* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>); to show that the dropped *m* must be a final, *tasmāt tāmrā apah* (vi.4.2<sup>4</sup>). The commentator, namely, has quietly introduced the limitation *pudāntah*, 'when final,' into his explanation of the rule, without pointing out whence he derives it: it comes, in fact, only from the general scope of the treatise, which thus far, having the relation of *pada* and *sāṁhitā* texts under treatment, has dealt almost exclusively with final and initial letters.

## यवकारपरश्चैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥३॥

3. As also, according to some teachers, when followed by *y* or *v*.

---

2. *rephaparaṣ<sup>1</sup>* co<sup>2</sup> "shmaparaṣ ca padānto<sup>3</sup> makārō hupyate. yathā<sup>4</sup>: praty----: sañ----: tañ----: sañ----: tvañ----: evampara iti kim: idam----: padānta iti kim: tasmāt----: <sup>5</sup>*rephāṣ* co "shmāṇaṣ<sup>6</sup> ca "rephoslmāṇah: te pare' yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ.

<sup>1</sup> W. *rephāṣ*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. *ca*. <sup>3</sup> B. -nte. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. -ma.

(<sup>1</sup>) B. G. M. O. *rephoslmāṇdu tāv parāu*.

retain an unchanged *m* before *rā*, and *sañrarâyah* (i.4.44<sup>1</sup>) to show that only *rā*, not *ra*, effects the retention.

According to W. B. O., the particle *iti* in the rule is intended to deny the application to the word here had in view of rule xiv.28, respecting duplication, and to assure the duplication of the *m* before the *r*. But G. M. insert *tu*, ‘but,’ in the rule after *iti*, ascribing to it the effect just defined, and making the *iti* simply signify that the words mentioned, and no others, are the subjects of the rule. And G. (not M.) writes the examples accordingly, *sammrâjam* and *sammrâjyâya*. That this bit of constructive interpretation is a pure figment of the commentators does not need to be pointed out; respecting its occasion and bearing, see the note to xiv.28. I have adopted the reading of W. etc., which is presumably the older and more genuine: in the comment on xiv.28, even G. M. agree with the others in making *iti* the bond of connection between the two rules.

### अथ वर्णानाम् ॥५॥

#### 5. Now of individual sounds.

According to the comment on rule xxiv.2 (see the note to that rule), we have here one of the main division lines of the treatise. Thus far, from the beginning of the fifth chapter, we have had to do chiefly with the combination of separate words or *padas* into connected text; now we turn to the determination of individual letters, which are read alike in both forms of text. That the intention of the treatise-makers recognized so grand a transition here may be doubted; but that the change is one of some importance is not questionable.

### ऋकार्काररषपूर्वी· नकारो एकारः समानपदे ॥६॥

6. Within the same word, a *n* preceded by *r*, *ṭ*, *r*, or *sh*, becomes *ṇ*.

5. *athe'ty ayam adhikârah: varñânâni samâhitâ vukshyata' ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam: ^atha vâ:^ athuçabdah^ padasainihitânishedhakah.<sup>4</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> O. *ucyata*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> B. *çabdah*. <sup>4</sup> B. *-tayâm nish-*.

6. *samânapada ekapada r̥kârarkârarephashakârapûrvo<sup>1</sup> nakâro ñakâram<sup>2</sup> ñpadyate<sup>3</sup>. tribhir----: tvâñ----: esha----: kr̥shno----. <sup>4</sup>evampûrva iti kim: devânâm----:<sup>4</sup> samânapada iti kim: ebhîr----. samânam ca tat padaiu ca samânapadam: tasmin.*

O. has a lacuna, beginning with *-napade* at the end of the rule, and ending with *tribhir ṛ-* in the first example. <sup>1</sup> G. M. *r̥kârareph-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ñatvam*. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. *çipnoti*. <sup>4</sup> O. om.

**पाणिगणपुण्यकण्काणगाणबाणवेणुगुणमणिप्रवदेषु  
पूर्वः ॥ ९ ॥**

9. Also, in the inflectional and derivative forms of *pāni*, *gana*, *punya*, *kanva*, *kāna*, *gāna*, *bāna*, *venu*, *guṇa*, and *manī*, the first nasal is *n*.

The word *pravāda* is not found elsewhere in our treatise or its commentary. From the latter's explanation and use of it we derive for it a meaning somewhat different from that which, according to Regnier (note to Rik Pr. ii.39), it bears in the Rik Prātiçākhya. The latter makes it mean 'theme:' in our comment, on the other hand, it evidently signifies a derived form of a theme, in any gender or case, in composition, or in extension by secondary suffix; and I have translated it accordingly. So far as I can see, however, the same signification belongs to it in most of the passages of the Rik Pr. also, and Regnier's exposition of its use calls for revision.

There is an abrupt change of implication here, without any intimation of it in the terms of the precept itself; it is only at the end of rule 14, below, that we find the word *prākṛtāḥ*, which we must understand as applying to rules 9–14—a kind of footing instead of heading (*adhikāru*): see another like case in the third chapter, rules 2–7 (note on iii.2). In this connected paragraph of rules we have an enumeration of the words in which a *n* is "original," and hence found equally in all the forms of the text.

The examples are *supāñih svāngurih* (iii.1.11<sup>4</sup>: iv.1.6<sup>3</sup>: O., in this and the two following examples, has only the first 'word'), *vrshapānayo 'gvāḥ* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>), and *hiranyapānīm utaye* (i.4.25: ii.2.12<sup>2</sup>): the text contains half a dozen other examples of the *pravādas* of *pāni*;—*gāndām tvā gaṇapatiṁ havāmahe* (ii.3.14<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word), *gānd me mā vi ṛshān* (iii.1.8<sup>2</sup>), *gaṇena gaṇam* (v.4.7<sup>7</sup>), and *dūreāñmitraç ca gaṇāḥ* (iv.6.5<sup>6</sup>): the cases,

9. *pāñi'tyādiçabdānām' pravādeshu pūrvaiḥ prathamo nākdrāḥ prakṛtyāi'vu veditavyah. prukarshena vādāḥ pravādāḥ: liṅga-vibhaktibhedasamāsataddhitādibhir<sup>4</sup> nirdeça<sup>5</sup> ity arthah. yathā<sup>6</sup>: sup----: vrshap----: hiran----: gāndānī----: gaṇā----: gaṇena----: dūre----: punyo----: sā----: kānva----: tasyāi----: akarṇayā----: gānap----: viçalyo----: venur----: venunā----: yad----: yathā----: maninā----: nanu yuṇaçabdā pravādatvād gāyagrahanam ayuktam: <sup>8</sup>māi'vam:<sup>9</sup> gaṇapravādatve sati tud bhavet: kintu gaṇapatiçubda-pravādo 'yam. pūrva iti kim: gaṇ----: ven----: man----: ityādīshā 'ttarasya<sup>10</sup> natvam mā bhāvā iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -ādināñi grahanānām. <sup>2</sup> W. -dāḥ. <sup>3</sup> W. -vādāḥ; G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. om. bhedā. <sup>5</sup> W. nirdishṭā. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> W. ivam. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. -ra-nakārasya.

The examples are *çitikanthāya ca* (iv.5.5<sup>1</sup>: but G. M. have instead *çitikanthāya svāhā*, which I do not find in the text, not even at vii.3.17, where a number of similar expressions are read) and *kandiyeta pāmanambhāvukāḥ* (vi.1.3<sup>2</sup>: O. has the first word only). The combinations *ṇt̄* and *ṇdh̄* do not occur in the Sanhitā.

चङ्गणफणत्स्थौद्विणायाद्विणोतिकीणेयोऽसिष्टात्ल्लव-  
णमुगणाश्रुतिश्वुपुणीकाबाणिजायाणवश्वाद्वाणरस्थाणुत्-  
णवेवीणायामश्चोणयापणेतवाणीःकल्याणीकृणपंवाणः-  
शतशोणाश्रुतिर्धाणिकमेणी ॥ १२ ॥

12. Also in *cañkuna*, *phañat*, *sthūnāu*, *hiñuyāt*, *hiñoti*, *kāru-neyah*, *anishthāh*, *ulbañam*, *uganā* wherever found, *cupuñikā*, *bāñijāya*, *anavaç ca*, *āñnārah*, *sthānum*, *tūñave*, *vīñayām*, *aclō-neyā*, *paneta*, *vāñih*, *kalyāñi*, *kunapam*, *vāñah* *cata*. *çonā* wherever found, *dhāñikā*, and *m enī*.

The passages aimed at are quoted by the commentator as follows: *avabhrtha nicañkuna niceruh* (i.4.45<sup>2</sup>: all but O. omit *niceruh*, which would allow the passage to be found also at vi.6.3<sup>4</sup>; O. omits *avabhrtha*): *nicañkuna* occurs a second time in i.4.45<sup>2</sup>; *anvāñpaniphanat* (i.7.8<sup>3</sup>); *ayāsthānāv uditdu* (i.8.12<sup>3</sup>); *bhrā-trvyāya pra hiñuyāt* (ii.2.6<sup>5</sup>: O. begins with *pra*); *evā 'smāi pra hiñoti* (ii.2.6<sup>5</sup>); *rajano vāi kāruneyah* (ii.3.8<sup>1</sup>); *ye 'nishthās tāñ* (ii.5.5<sup>2</sup>); *yajña ulbañam kriyate* (iii.4.3<sup>7</sup>), and also, by i.53, *anulba-ñam* (at iii.4.3<sup>6</sup>); *āvyādhiñer ugāñi uta* (iv.1.10<sup>2</sup>: the example is wanting in W.) and *ugāñabhyas trñhatibhyas* (iv.5.4<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word); *varshayanti cupuñikā nāmā 'si* (iv.4.5<sup>1</sup>: only W. has the first word, and it omits the last); *mantrine bāñijāya kakshāñpām pataye* (iv.5.2<sup>2</sup>: B. G. M. omit the first word, G.

11. 'tavarge pare<sup>1</sup> nañkāraḥ<sup>2</sup> prakṛtyāi 'va veditavyah. çiti-  
----: kand----. tavargah paro yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ.

<sup>1)</sup> B. G. M. -rgaparah; O. -rgaparo vā. <sup>2)</sup> G. M. put after 'va

12. cañkuna----- eshu nañkāraḥ prakṛtyāi 'va veditavyah.  
avabh----: anv----: aya----: bhrāt----: evā----: ra-  
jano----: ye----: yajña----: yatravatra grutir ugāñagraha-  
nasya<sup>3</sup> tatratatra nañvam karañyam: <sup>4</sup>āvyā----: ugāñ----:  
varsh----: mantrine----: priy----: ee 'ti kim: anavas  
----: etam----: ya----: yā----: aclōneyā----: pane----:  
indram----: kalyāñi----: purushak----: vāñah----: cata  
'ti kim: <sup>5</sup>rtāv----: <sup>6</sup>çonā----: <sup>7</sup>grutir iti kim: <sup>8</sup>çonāya----:  
ni----: vanas----: makārena kim: ubhay----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. put before *yatra* <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. om.

pause of division, he gives (the whole subject is omitted in O.) *vrshann agne viçvāny arya ā* (iv.4.4<sup>4</sup>), *tasmāt saptugirshan* (v.1.7<sup>1</sup>), *brahman viçam ri* (ii.3.3<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *vi*), *akshann amimādanta* (i.8.5<sup>2</sup>), and *paçūnām carman* (vi.1.9<sup>2</sup>).

This disposes of all the *avagrahas* cited in the rule save *carshan*. No such *pada* as *carshan* is to be found in the Tāittirīya-Sanhita, nor, so far as has yet come to light, in any other Vedic text; nor does the word seem like one that could anywhere occur. One cannot help surmising that its presence in the rule may be by a blunder merely, it being, perhaps, an unintelligent repetition of *carman*. But, by whatever hap or mishap it found its way in, it is now an accepted part of the text, and has to be dealt with. And the commentator first creeps out of the difficulty through the hole to which he usually betakes himself in a like case, asserting that the passage aimed at is read in another text (*gākhā*). He then proceeds to state that "some quote as here referred to the passage *mitrasya carshanidhrtah gravah* (iii.4.11<sup>5</sup> and iv.1.6<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *gravah*): this is not good, since the words are quoted in the rule by way of antecedent exception to an exception [to rule 6] which is to be made farther on, by the words 'nor when final, nor by the omission of *a*' (rule 15); and in *carshanidhrtah* the *n* is not final. Or: others are of opinion that the words in question are specified for the sake of removing any doubt which might arise as to whether the *n* in them were a product of alteration under rule 6 of this chapter; and, in this aspect, the citation of *mitrasya carshanidhrtah* is to be approved." The logic of this final conclusion I entirely fail to see: for no question can possibly arise as to whether the *n* of *carshanidhrtah* falls under rule 6; that it does so is palpable and undeniable.

As we should expect, considering the way in which the Prātiçākhyā treats the cases, these words are read with *n* in the *pada*-text also: namely *vrshan-vān*, *brahman-vantah*, and so on. The same is the case in the *pada*-texts of the Rik and the Atharvan (see Ath. Pr. iv.99).

ऋषाषसाण्णामारवणा चेति प्राकृताः ॥ १४ ॥

14. Also in *r̥ṇn*, *shann*, *shn*, *m̥n*, and *rāvñ*—these are original.

The application of the term *prākṛtāḥ*, 'original,' in this rule is, as was pointed out above (under rule 9), to all the cases rehearsed in rules 9–14.

---

"*diprāptter atra nakāro vāikṛta iti gañkānirākurañārtham etāni  
grahañānīty anye*" manyante: tathā sati *mitrasya carshanidhṛta  
ity udāharanām ramanīyam*. <sup>10</sup>*avagraha*<sup>11</sup> iti kim: *vrshann*  
----: *tasmāt*----: *brahman*----: *akshann*----: *paçūnām*  
----. *avagrahīstho*<sup>12</sup> 'ragraha iti lakshyate.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. -ne; G. M. -diśhu gr-. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> W. -shanh-. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om.  
<sup>6</sup> W. -haranānī. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. ṛkārā. <sup>9</sup> B. anena. <sup>10</sup> O. om. <sup>11</sup> W. -ha-  
stā. <sup>12</sup> G. M. put next before *lakshyate*.

themes (*aryaman*, *-krávan*, *grávan*), a “loss of *a*” (*alopa*): compare what is said of this *alopa* below.

As regards the application of the term *prākṛta*, ‘original,’ their discordance is more essential, and, indeed, irreconcilable. In *trṇṇa*, to be sure, the cerebral *n*’s are as original as in the words specified by rule 13, since, in all alike, the alteration is an accomplished fact in all the forms of text, although ultimately referable to the cause laid down in rule 6. But the last three cases, although also read alike in all texts, are introduced here as counter-exceptions to rule 15, and their *n* is no more original than is that of any other of the words falling under rule 6. And finally, there is no sense whatever in which the lingual nasals of *-shanna* are “original.” To call them all original, then, seems even more than a looseness or inaccuracy in the use of that term: it is a blunder.

The commentator perceives the difficulty, and attempts to remove it by a lengthy passage of special pleading. The term *prākṛta*, he says, is *mukhya*, ‘of primary value’ or ‘of full force,’ as applied to the words beginning with *páni* (rule 9) and ending with *carshan* (rule 13), since in them the lingualized nasal is found in all the four *śuñhitās*; but in *rṇn* and the rest it is not *mukhya*, but is simply intended to authorize the nasalization even in the absence of a rule prescribing it. Thus, namely: in *rṇn* etc. (i. e. in *rṇn* and *shann*), the first nasal constitutes an exception (under rule 6) as being followed by a mute (rule 15); the other nasal, as having a *t*-mute between it and the altering cause (rule 15). In *shn* and *mn*, again [why not in *rāvñ?*], the nasal falls under the exception touching the loss of *a* (rule 15). And if it be objected that the lingualization is assured by the competency of the citation—still [it is answered], the implication is avoided that the occasion of the citation is the originality of the *n* [?]. Moreover, the word *ca*, ‘also,’ in the rule, being used in the sense of subsidiary adjunction (*anvācaya*), shows the lingualization to be not of primary value; if it were primary, it would be found in all the four kinds of text; but it is not so found; for we read in *pada*-text *abhisannā ity abhi-sannāḥ* and *nishāṇḍye 'ti ni-sannāya*. And since, from the words *púshān* and *aryaman*, which end in *n*, such forms as *púshno rañhyādi* and *aryamne carum* are read in the *varṇa*-text, therefore the conversion into *n* (all but O. say “non-conversion into *n*”) in

<sup>11</sup>*itarasyo 'ttamasya<sup>11</sup> ṣavargiyavyavahitatvāt<sup>12</sup>: shnammagraha-*  
*nayos tv alopād iti nishedhah. grahanasāmarthyād eva<sup>13</sup> ṣatvam*  
*sidhyati 'ti cet: evam svabhāvatvam eva grahaṇasyā 'pi<sup>14</sup> mālam*  
*iti pariḥārah. kim ca: anvācaye<sup>15</sup> vartumānaç cakāro 'py eteshu*  
*ṣatvam amukhyam<sup>16</sup> iti dyotayati: mukhyam<sup>17</sup> cet: catasr̄shu*  
*sāṁhitāsu vidyeta<sup>18</sup>: na cā 'tra vidyate: tathā hi: abhisannā*  
*ity abhi-sannāḥ: nishāṇḍye 'ti ni-sannāya: ity atra<sup>19</sup>*  
*padasāṁhitāyām: púshān aryamann iti nakārāntaçabda-*  
*yoh: púshno rañhyādi: aryamne carum: ity ādi siddharū-*  
*patvād<sup>20</sup> atra varṇasāṁhitāyām etatsāhacaryād ekasūtrasthāyor<sup>21</sup>*

Under the first part of the rule, the passages aimed at are quoted as follows: *sushumnaḥ sūryaraṣmīḥ* (iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>), *indrāgnibhyāṁ tvā sayujā* (iv.4.5<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *sayujā*; the *pada*-reading is doubtless *indrāgni-bhyām*, so that the *r* and *n* are *samānapade*, as required by rule 6), and *yushmānīto abhayāṁ jyotiḥ* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: only O. has *jyotiḥ*; from its inclusion here, the word must remain undivided in *pada*-text, though in that of the Rig-Veda [ii.27.11] it is read *yushmāñ-nitāḥ*).

Examples of final *n* not lingualized are *pitṛn havishe attave* (i.6.12<sup>1</sup>) and *pra mṛṇīhi ṣatṛān* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>).

The precept touching the omission of an *a* has reference, so far as I can discover, only to the oblique cases of *vṛtrāhan*, of which two (and I have failed to note any others) are cited, namely *vṛtraghnu* *indrāya tvā* (i.4.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the example) and *vṛtraghna* *stonāḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>1</sup>)—for the derivative adjective *vārtraghna* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup> et al.) can hardly be aimed at; and yet, the authority of this rule is needed to establish the dental *n* in this word also, which would otherwise fall under rule xiii.6. The mode of definition of the cases here intended is in very remarkable contrast with the usage elsewhere of the treatise, which, as has been repeatedly pointed out, differs from the other Prātiçākhyas especially in avoiding all reference to grammatical categories, forms, and derivations, and defining the words to which its rules relate simply by external circumstances of position and surroundings in the text. And this departure from its custom is a quite unfortunate and ill-judged one: for, in the first place, it renders necessary a part of the specifications of the preceding rule (namely *śṛṇ*, *mṛṇ*, and *rāvṇ*), which really lie outside the province of the treatise, and have no good reason to be mentioned; and, in the second place, as the commentator points out, it involves an inconsistency with the general subject of the chapter, which has to do with conversions arising *samānapade*, ‘within the limits of the same *pada*’, while in *vṛtraghnāḥ* etc. the affecting cause is in one *pada* and the nasal to be affected in another. The commentator explains that the intent is, by a far-reaching glance backward (literally, ‘a lion’s look’), to lay down a further example to a rule in the seventh chapter, where the restriction *samānapade* is not in force: *ghnāḥ* etc., namely, are altered forms of *han*, whose

---

15. *shumnaḥ*<sup>1</sup>: *agnih*<sup>2</sup>: *yushmāñitāḥ*: *etesu*<sup>3</sup> *nakāro* *natvāṁ nā* "padyate: *sush-*...: *indrā-*...: *yushm-*... *antah*<sup>4</sup> *pādānto* *nakāro* *natvāṁ nā*"padyate: *pitṛn*...: *pra*... *alopād* *akāralopāt*<sup>5</sup> *puro* 'pi *nakāro* *natvāṁ nā*"padyate: 'vṛtra-...: vṛtra-... *nanv* *atra* *nimittaninittinor* *bhinnapadasthatvād* *vishamo* *drṣhtāntah*: *satyam*: *siñhāvalokananyāyena*<sup>7</sup> *prathama*  
*pragñe*<sup>8</sup> *saptamādhyāye*<sup>9</sup> *geshodāharaṇarūpeṇa*<sup>10</sup> *ghatate*: *atra ca* *samānapadaniyamo*<sup>11</sup> *nā* 'stī: *ghna* *iti* *asya* *hançabdavi*  
*krtatvād*<sup>12</sup> *rashahpūrvō* *havani*<sup>13</sup> (vii.11) 'ti *prāptih*. <sup>14</sup> *spar*  
*çaparo* *nakāruç* *ca*<sup>15</sup> *natvāṁ nā*"*proti*<sup>16</sup>: *samkr-*...: *ava*...

Under the first part of the rule, the passages aimed at are quoted as follows: *sushumnah sūryaraṣṭmih* (iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>), *indrāgnibhyāṁ tvā sayujā* (iv.4.5<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *sayujā*; the *pada*-reading is doubtless *indrāgni-bhyām*, so that the *r* and *n* are *samānapade*, as required by rule 6), and *yushmānito abhayāṁ jyotiḥ* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: only O. has *jyotiḥ*; from its inclusion here, the word must remain undivided in *pada*-text, though in that of the Rig-Veda [ii.27.11] it is read *yushmā-nitah*).

Examples of final *n* not lingualized are *pitṛn havishe attave* (i. 6.12<sup>1</sup>) and *pra mr̥nihi ṣatrāṇ* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>).

The precept touching the omission of an *a* has reference, so far as I can discover, only to the oblique cases of *vṛtrahan*, of which two (and I have failed to note any others) are cited, namely *vṛtraghnu indrāya tvā* (i.4.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the example) and *vṛtraghna stomaḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>1</sup>)—for the derivative adjective *vṛtraghna* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup> et al.) can hardly be aimed at; and yet, the authority of this rule is needed to establish the dental *n* in this word also, which would otherwise fall under rule xiii.6. The mode of definition of the cases here intended is in very remarkable contrast with the usage elsewhere of the treatise, which, as has been repeatedly pointed out, differs from the other Prātiçākhyas especially in avoiding all reference to grammatical categories, forms, and derivations, and defining the words to which its rules relate simply by external circumstances of position and surroundings in the text. And this departure from its custom is a quite unfortunate and ill-judged one: for, in the first place, it renders necessary a part of the specifications of the preceding rule (namely *shn*, *mn*, and *rāvñ*), which really lie outside the province of the treatise, and have no good reason to be mentioned; and, in the second place, as the commentator points out, it involves an inconsistency with the general subject of the chapter, which has to do with conversions arising *samānapade*, ‘within the limits of the same *pada*’, while in *vṛtra-ghnah* etc. the affecting cause is in one *pada* and the nasal to be affected in another. The commentator explains that the intent is, by a far-reaching glance backward (literally, ‘a lion’s look’), to lay down a further example to a rule in the seventh chapter, where the restriction *samānapade* is not in force: *ghnah* etc., namely, are altered forms of *han*, whose

---

15. *shumnah<sup>1</sup>*: *agnih<sup>2</sup>*: *yushmānitah<sup>3</sup>*: *eteshu<sup>4</sup>* *nakāro* *natvām nā*<sup>5</sup> *"padyate*: *sush-*...: *indrā-*...: *yushm-*... *antah<sup>6</sup>* *pādānto* *nakāro* *natvām nā*<sup>7</sup> *"padyate*: *pitṛn-*...: *pra-*... *aloḍād akāralopāt<sup>8</sup>* *paro* ‘*pi* *nakāro* *natvām nā*<sup>9</sup> *"padyate*: ‘*vṛtra-*...<sup>10</sup> *vṛtra-*... *nanv* *atra* *nimittaninittinor* *bhinnapadasthatvād vishamo* *dr̥ṣṭāntah*: *satyam*: *siṁhāvalokananyāyena*<sup>11</sup> *prathama* *prāṇe*<sup>12</sup> *saptamāddhyāye*<sup>13</sup> *ceṣhodāharanarāpeṇa*<sup>14</sup> *ghaṭate*: *atra ca* *samānapadāniyamo*<sup>15</sup> *nā* ‘*sti*’: *ghna* *ity asya* *hançabdavi-kṛtavād<sup>16</sup>* *rashah pūrvō* *havani*<sup>17</sup> (vii.11) ‘*ti* *prāptih*. <sup>18</sup> *spṛ-* *çaparo* *nakāruç ca*<sup>19</sup> *natvām nā*<sup>20</sup> *"pnoti*<sup>21</sup>: *samkr-*...: *ava-*...

an intervening *ç* or *s*, or a palatal, lingual, or dental mute: namely *raçanām d̄ datte* (vi.3.6<sup>3</sup>), *agne rasena tejasā* (i.4.46<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have *tejasā*), *rocante rocanā divi* (vii.4.20: O. omits *rocante*), *somañ r̄jānam* (i.7.10<sup>1</sup> et al.), *prakrīdinoh payodhāh* (iv.3.13<sup>7</sup>), *pṛtanā jayāmi* (iii.5.3<sup>1,2</sup>), and *janaprathānāya svāhā* (iii.2.8<sup>1</sup>: only O. has *svāhā*; G. M. have the false reading *-pradha-*, and O. has dropped out a part of the word, giving *janādāya*).

In the note to Ath. Pr. iii.94, I have pointed out the physical reason why these sounds, by their interposition, prevent the lingualization of the nasal: they are, all of them, such as call into action for their utterance the tip of the tongue, throwing it out of adjustment for the lingual contact. The tendency which the history of Aryan language in India exhibits toward the conversion of dentals into linguals shows itself most actively in the case of the nasal: the tongue, being rolled back into the position of lingual articulation by the utterance of *r*, *t̄*, *r̄*, or *sh*, hangs suspended there, as it were, and makes the next nasal contact lingual, unless the tendency is satisfied by the intermediate production of such a contact, or frustrated by the transfer elsewhere of the articulating organ.

The Prātiçākhya's enumeration of the cases of occurrence of the lingual nasal is, so far as I have been able to determine, complete. No one of the other treatises undertakes such an enumeration.

पृतस्वरात्परो लो उं पौष्करसादेः पौष्करसादेः ॥ १६ ॥

16. In the opinion of Pāushkarasādi, *l* after a mixed vowel becomes *d̄*.

The mention of Pāushkarasādi (O. has everywhere Pāuskarasādi), the commentator says, is out of respect, and not because the rule is not a peremptory one. "Mixed vowel" is a term which is not elsewhere employed by the treatise, nor does the latter contain anything that should intimate an explanation of its meaning. The comment glosses it by 'the sound *r̄*.' It appears, then, that *r̄* is thus styled, from having its vocalic quality "mixed" with consonantal, namely, with the *r*-sound. The other Prātiçākhyas (see

---

*satsu nakāro nūtvum nā padyate: yathā<sup>22</sup>: raçanām----: agne----: rocante----: somañ----: prakrī----: pṛtanā----: janā----. rkārarkārā* (xiii.5) "diprāpteh<sup>23</sup> pratishedho<sup>24</sup> 'yam vihitah.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. O. *sunnah*; G. M. *sushumnah*. <sup>2</sup> W. O. *agni*. <sup>3</sup> O. *eshu*; G. M. *eshu* *grahaneshu*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. *tatah*. <sup>5</sup> W. B. O. *om*. <sup>6</sup> O. *om*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-kanena*. <sup>8</sup> O. *om*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *-yāya*. <sup>10</sup> W. O. *vīches-*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. O. *-datvani-*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *-bdādhikr-*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *dr̄shṭih pūrvō bhavati*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *ins. sparçaparah*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *"padyate*. <sup>17</sup> B. G. M. *tra*. <sup>18</sup> B. *-vīcheshayor*. <sup>19</sup> O. *vīkṣhyate*; G. M. *pi vā yuj-* *yate*. <sup>20</sup> W. B. *yathā*; G. M. *athā 'pi*. <sup>21</sup> O. *-ddha*; W. *pratisiddha*. <sup>22</sup> W. *ce 'ti*; O. *om*. <sup>23</sup> O. *om*. <sup>24</sup> W. B. O. *ins. ca*. <sup>25</sup> W. O. *etal*. <sup>26</sup> B. *sūtravy-*; G. M. *sū-* *tre vy-*. <sup>27</sup> G. M. *spashṭik-*. <sup>28</sup> W. *pūrvo*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. *ins. vyavāyishu*. <sup>30</sup> B. *ins. vy-* *avāyeshu*. <sup>31</sup> G. M. O. *om*. <sup>32</sup> in W. only. <sup>33</sup> G. M. *-tih*. <sup>34</sup> W. O. *pratinish-*.

sion') of the rule founded on the authority of the grammarians, who assert a homogeneousness of the *dvighlishṭa l* and of the *d*, as being both produced in the lingual position: and if the question is raised as to how it is so founded, reference is made to a rule of Pāṇini (i.1.50), which prescribes that, in case of substitution, the most nearly related letter is to be taken. I do not see that this exposition and reference have any pertinence whatever.

Then, the commentator adds yet another interpretation, which, he remarks, is also highly esteemed. It differs from the one already given only in implying (apparently, from xiii.6) *samānapade*, 'within the limits of a single *padu*', taking, then, a different example, *te no mrdayantu* (iv.4.3<sup>2</sup> et al.), with the counter-example *ilāmīdam bhavati* (vii.5.9<sup>1</sup>)—which, in view of the frequent occurrence in the Sanhitā of *idā*, *idāvant*, and their like, is not much to the point—and finally, as further counter-example, to justify the restriction *samānapade*, the phrase *pitrlokañ somena* (ii.6.2<sup>1</sup>; p. *pitr-lokam*), where the *l* does not become *d* after *r*. But in this last case is involved an additional difficulty; namely, that in the compound *pitrlokukāmasya* (vi.6.4<sup>1</sup>; p. *pitrloka-kāmasya*) the *r* and *l* do meet *samānapade*, and yet the *l* maintains itself: over this, the commentator hobbles as best he may, with the plea that, prohibition having been made in the case of *pitrloka*, it is extended by association to the further compound.

The groundlessness and unintelligence of all this special pleading, resorted to for the purpose of forcing in as an integral part of the Prātiçākhya a precept altogether foreign to it, is palpable enough; and one grudges the time and words spent in its exposure.

*svarād ṛkārāt<sup>22</sup> paro lakāro dākāram āpadyute. yathā<sup>23</sup>: te-----  
prktasvarād iti kim: ilām-----: samānupada iti kim: pitṛl-----  
sahucāritvād<sup>24</sup> ekasya<sup>25</sup> nishiddha<sup>26</sup> itarasyād'pi pitṛloka-  
kāmasye<sup>27</sup> 'ty asyā 'pi<sup>28</sup> samānapadatve suty api nishedho bha-  
vati. idam api pāthāntaram bahvādṛtam.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhya-vivarane  
trayodaśo<sup>29</sup> 'dhyāyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om. <sup>2</sup> B. om.; G. M. *lo dam*. <sup>3</sup> all but B. *duy-l*; B. *jñako*; O. *jñō*; G. M. *jñakam*. <sup>4</sup> O. everywhere *pauṣka*. <sup>5</sup> W. *-tena*; B. *-taīñ*. <sup>6</sup> B. *-vad*. <sup>7</sup> B. *iti*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. *-di*. <sup>9</sup> W. om. <sup>10</sup> all but B. *duç-l*; W. B. *-shtadala-k*; O. *lakāra-dak-*; G. M. *-tadakār-*. <sup>11</sup> O. *sadr̥yasamāñjō dākāram*. <sup>12</sup> W. *-sirāt*; G. M. *-sāra*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *ucyate*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. ins. *varṇānam*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. O. *-mas* *sadr̥atama*. <sup>16</sup> W. *asya*; O. *sūtra*. <sup>17</sup> B. *iti*. <sup>18</sup> B. ins. *iti*. <sup>19</sup> O. *-sāda ity*; G. M. *ity* only. <sup>20</sup> G. M. *-dasya*, and om. *ity asya*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. ins. *pakshe*. <sup>22</sup> W. om. <sup>23</sup> O. om. <sup>24</sup> W. B. O. *-caritatv-*. <sup>25</sup> O. *-smiñ*. <sup>26</sup> B. *nishedha*. <sup>27</sup> W. B. *-kasye*; G. M. *-lokamasye*. <sup>28</sup> G. M. O. om. *api*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. O. *dvitīye praçne prathamo*.

The commentator offers a single example, *uru prathasva*, i. e. *uru pprathassva* (i.1.8 et al.: the MSS. of the comment only very rarely and irregularly write the groups in their duplicated form, so as to illustrate the rules of the chapter), and adds counter-examples: first, to show that the consonant is liable to duplication only after a vowel, *tat pravde* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>: hardly a well-chosen example, since, though the *p* of *pra* is this time unchanged, the *t* before it must be doubled, *tatt pr-*; a *pra* after a pause would have answered better); second, that the duplication takes place only before a consonant, *urukṛd uru nah* (ii.6.11<sup>3</sup>); third, that only a consonant, not a vowel, in the defined position, is duplicated, *prāgama uktham* (iv.4.2<sup>1</sup>). O. appends a new set of counter-examples, as if a part of a new exposition; namely *prajānanam* (i.5.9<sup>1</sup>), *padbhyām dve savane* (vi.1.6<sup>4</sup>: an ill-chosen example, containing cases of duplication as well as of its omission), and *ugānd uta* (iv.1.10<sup>2</sup>).

## लवकारपूर्व स्पशश्च पौष्करसादे: ॥ २ ॥

2. Likewise, according to Pāushkarasādi, a mute preceded by *l* or *v*.

The commentator declares that the *ca*, ‘likewise,’ in this rule brings down from the one preceding the being preceded by a vowel, and duplication. The former part of the defined implication is at least otiose, since *l* and *v* never occur in the Sanhitā before a mute, except as themselves preceded by a vowel: *v*, indeed, is found in combination only with the nasal mutes, *n* and *n̄*; *l*, in the groups *lk*, *lg*, *lp*, *lb*, *lh*, *lm*, and *lpy*. The examples quoted are *kalpān juhoti* (v.4.8<sup>5</sup>) and *vibhudāvne* (iii.5.8<sup>1</sup>, 9<sup>2</sup>: all save B. actually read this time *-dāvne*, with doubled *n*). According to the interpretation given to the next rule, the worthy Pāushkarasādi does not regard the duplication of the mute after the semivowel as suspending the duplication of its predecessor also, by rule 1; and he would accordingly read *kalppān* and *-dāvne*; and this part of his doctrine is, as we shall see, declared unapproved.

Counter-examples are given: *kalyāñi rūpasamrddhā* (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>: to be pronounced *kallyāñi*, or, by rule 21, *kalyāñi*) and *vāyavyam* (i.8.7<sup>1</sup> et al.: to be made *vāyavvyam*), to show that no other letter than a mute is thus doubled; and *kācmañ chukubhih* (v.7.23) and *tasmād etat* (vi.3.11<sup>6</sup>), instancing other consonants than *l* and *v*, with the following mute not doubled: in these words, the sibilant

---

2. pāushkarasāder<sup>1</sup> mate lakarapīrvo<sup>2</sup> vakārapīrvo vā spargo<sup>3</sup> dvivarnam āpadyate<sup>4</sup>. kalpān<sup>5</sup> .. vibh----- svarapīrva-  
tvām dvitvām cā 'nvādiçati cakārah<sup>6</sup>.<sup>7</sup> sparga<sup>8</sup> iti kim: kaly-  
----: vāy----- evampīrva iti kim: kūç----- tasm-----<sup>9</sup> lakā-  
raç-ca vakāraç ca lavakārau<sup>10</sup>: tāu pūrvāu yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ.

<sup>1</sup> O. *paushkar-*, as also in the rule. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. ins. vā. <sup>3</sup> O. *dvitvam āpnoti*.  
<sup>4</sup> G. M. put at beginning of clause. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sparçapara*. <sup>7</sup> W. O. *lakāraç*.

i. e. *arcanty arkkam arkkinaḥ*), *arkyena vāi* (vii.5.9<sup>1</sup>: i. e. *arkk-yena*: wanting in O.), and *ūrg vā udumbaraḥ* (v.1.10<sup>1</sup> et al.: i. e. *ūrgg vāi*).

The *ca*, ‘also,’ of the rule, according to the commentator, implies duplication, and precedence of the *r* by a vowel (bringing down *svarapūrva* from rule 1). The question is raised by an objector whether sequence of the consonant following the *r* by another consonant (in virtue of *vyanjanupuram* in rule 1) is not also implied: but such sequence is declared not obligatory; and it is pointed out that later rules (15,16), exempting a consonant in *paisā*, and a spirant before a vowel, from duplication after *r*, prove that the present rule prescribes duplication also where no consonant follows, and where a vowel follows; since there would be no propriety in denying by a special rule what had not been already enjoined by a general rule. In support of his assertion that the *r* must be preceded by a vowel, the commentator cites the word *tryambakam* (i.8.6<sup>2</sup>), in which he says that the *y* must not be doubled: and he fortifies his claim by appealing to Pāṇini’s rule (viii.4.46), which expressly restricts duplication after *r* and *h* to cases in which these letters follow a vowel (G. M. add the remark that in Pāṇini also no implication of *vyanjanaparam*, ‘followed by a consonant,’ is found). The Vāj. Pr. (iv.102) makes an equivalent restriction explicitly. The groups are not numerous in the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā in which a *r* that does not stand first is followed by a consonant, and the only consonant so following is *y*: the combinations are *jry*, *try*, *ñtry*, *ttry*, *ntry*, *stry*, and *tstry*.

This finishes the proper exposition and illustration of the rule; but the commentator suffers himself to be enticed into a lengthy and tedious refutation of a trivial suggestion which some one has been impertinent enough to make. There are those, he says, who

4. *rephāt parai*<sup>1</sup> *vyanjanam*<sup>2</sup> *dvivarnam*<sup>3</sup> *āpadyatē*<sup>4</sup>: <sup>5</sup> *yathā*<sup>6</sup>: *arc-*-----: <sup>7</sup> *arky-----*: <sup>8</sup> *ūrg-----*: <sup>9</sup> *svarapūrvadvitvayor* *ākar-*  
*shakaç cakārah*. *nanu*<sup>10</sup> *vyanjanuparativākarshakah* *kim na syāt*:  
*ne* ‘*ti*’ *brūmāh*: *niyamābhārāt*: *tathā hi*: *avusāne*<sup>11</sup> (xiv.15)  
*ashmā svarapara* (xiv.16) *ity etannishedhudvayena rephāt pa-*  
*rasya*<sup>12</sup> *vyanjanasya*<sup>13</sup> *vyanjanuparativābhāve*<sup>14</sup> *svarapūrvatve*<sup>15</sup> ‘*pi*  
*dvitvam* *astī* ‘*ti*’ *nigcīyute*<sup>16</sup>: *aprasaktapratishedhānupapatteh*<sup>17</sup>:  
*svarapūrvatvānvedeçena*<sup>18</sup> *kim*: *tryambakam* *ity* *ādāu* *mā*  
*bhūd* *iti*: *kim ca*: <sup>19</sup> *aco rahābhyaṁ dve* *iti*<sup>20</sup> *pāñiniyasātrenā*  
‘*pi* *svarapūrvatve* *saty eva*<sup>21</sup> *dvitvam* *vidhiyate*: <sup>22</sup> *tusyā*<sup>23</sup> ‘*yam*  
*arthāh*: *aca* *uttarāu* *yāu* *rephahakārāu* *tābhyaṁ* *uttarasya* *yaro*  
*dve bhāvata*<sup>24</sup> *iti*.<sup>25</sup>

*kecid evam* *ścūh*<sup>26</sup>: *svarapūrvādiçabdāvad* *rephapiurvam* *iti*  
*vācyē*<sup>27</sup> *vāco*<sup>28</sup> *yuktyantaram* *urthāntaram* *samarthayati*<sup>29</sup>: *ahur*  
---- *ity* *ādāu*<sup>30</sup> *vākrtarephād*<sup>31</sup> *uttarasya*<sup>32</sup> *na syād* *dvitvam*<sup>33</sup> *iti*.  
*tad etadudhyayanaviruddhapaddhatim* *adhyāste*<sup>34</sup>: *vayam* *tu va-*

## द्वितीयचतुर्थयोस्तु व्यञ्जनोत्तरयोः पूर्वः ॥५॥

5. In place, however, of second and fourth mutes, when followed by consonants, is put the preceding mute.

That is to say, when an aspirate occurs between a preceding vowel (as the commentator specifies in his paraphrase of the rule) and a following consonant, or in such circumstances that by rule 1 it would be doubled, it receives instead an increment (*āgama*) of the mute next preceding it in its own series, or of its corresponding non-aspirate. Examples are *vikhāya* (i. e. *vikkhyāya*) *cakshushūtvam* (iv.1.2<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words) and *mehyā* (i. e. *megghyā*) *vidyuto vācaḥ* (v.2.11<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have *vācaḥ*); to which W. B. add *tat savitūḥ* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> et al.; the *t* is converted to *th* by xiv.12, and to the *th* is then prefixed *t*, making *tath savitūḥ*) and *sādhyā* (i. e. *sāddhyā*) *rāi devāḥ* (vi.3.4<sup>8</sup> et al.). To show that only the aspirates are thus treated, is quoted *ādyam* (i. e. *āddyam*) *asyā 'nnam* (ii.2.5<sup>6</sup>: O. omits *annam*); to show that a vowel must precede, *vashat svāhā* (vii.3.12; by v.33, *t* is inserted between *t* and *s*, and the inserted letter is made *th* by xiv.12; then, by this rule, no farther change of the *th* occurs, and we read *vashatth*, not *vashattttth*; W. goes so far on this road as to read *vashath svāhā*) and *pādbhyāmī* (i. e. *paddbhyaṁī*, not *paddbbhyaṁī*) *dve savane* (vi.1.6<sup>4</sup>)—but G. M. O. substitute for the former another similar case, *vat svayamabhibhūrtāya* (iii.2.8<sup>1</sup> seven times: i. e. *vatth sv-*; O. writes *vatth sv-*); to show that a consonant must follow, *ukhāyādi sadane sve* (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup> et al.: W. B. omit *sve*) and *mehyāyate svāhā* (vii.5.11<sup>1</sup>). The word *tu*, ‘however,’ in the rule, the commentator (with more than his usual success in dealing with this particle) explains as intimating the denial of duplication, enjoined by rule 1. He adds that some give the particle a different interpretation, as

---

5. *dvitiyacaturthayoh<sup>1</sup> svarupārvayor vyanjanottarayoh pūrvagamo bhavuti: yathākramena dvitiyasya prathamaç caturthasya trtiyah. yathā<sup>2</sup>: vi----: me----: <sup>3</sup>tat----: sā----<sup>3</sup> dvitiyucaturthayor iti kim: ādyam---- evampūrva<sup>4</sup> iti kim: vashat----: pad----: evamparuyor<sup>5</sup> iti kim: ukh----: megh---- prathamusitrena prasaktam dvitvāñ nivartayati tuçubdhā. anye tv anyathā manyante: pūrvāgumasya dvitvāñ nivartayati 'ti. nāi 'tat sāram: savarṇasavargiyapara (xiv.23) ity uttaranishedhād<sup>6</sup> eva tasya tannivṛtiḥ<sup>7</sup>.*

*atra kecid dhuh: vyanjanaparayor iti vācye<sup>8</sup> vāco yuktyantaram arthāntaram sūcayati<sup>9</sup>: sāṁhitāsāṁhitusādharanam<sup>10</sup> paranimittam<sup>11</sup> uktam<sup>12</sup>: tata<sup>13</sup> ihā 'nyatarastha<sup>14</sup> āgamanimittatve prāpte 'sāṁhitapadānām nityatvāt tadgruhaṇam<sup>15</sup> eva<sup>16</sup> nyāyyam iti kṛtvā vāikṛtavyaṇjanaparative sati nāi 'tat vīdhānam bhavuti<sup>17</sup>: yathā: abhy asthād ity adi. nā 'yam pakshah: adhyayuma-*

rule. For, the intent is to cast out or deny a duplication established by the fundamental rule (xiv.1), where the being preceded by a vowel and followed by a consonant was implied; and there no limitation was laid down for the following consonant; hence, it is improper to lay one down here, where an exception is prescribed.

The commentator then goes on to say that he will set forth the real intent of the difference of phraseology, with due regard to the Qikshā, and in accordance with the accepted reading of the text. But I am compelled to confess myself incapable of extracting a satisfactory meaning from his exposition and argument. The point of it is an asserted absence of *niyama* in the two rules (1 and 5), as of one suffering and the other prescribing exception. *Niyama*, ‘obligatory force,’ appears to signify here joint application, and so a mutual or reciprocal influence. When a vowel precedes, he continues, a consonant is doubled only when followed by a consonant; and second and fourth mutes take increment of the mute that stands before them in the alphabet only when followed by a consonant. But the pair of rules in question is constructed with the intent of multiplicity (‘diversity’ or ‘independence?’ *prācūrya* is not found elsewhere). How does an absence of *niyama* appear? Why, from the fact that otherwise a twofold effect would in some cases come to light. In *atā havīnshi* (ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>) and in *annapate* (iv.2.3<sup>1</sup> et al.), and so on, there is duplication; in *prachac chandah* (iv.3.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. have instead *acchāvākah*, the reference for which I have failed to note) and *addhi tvām deva prayatā* (ii.6.12<sup>5</sup>: G. M. O. omit *prayatā*), and so on, there is increment of a preceding mute; but in *tāñ haste* (vi.1.3<sup>7</sup>: W. has *tāñ te* [iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>]), but doubtless by accidental omission of *ha*), even though it falls under the rule, the same effect is not seen: hence, there is

*svarāt<sup>40</sup> pūrvasya<sup>41</sup> varṇasya kvacid dvitvam ca kathyate<sup>42</sup>:*  
*na ca vargadvitiyasya na caturthe kādā<sup>43</sup> cana.*  
*vyākhyātām ca vacanām etadvidvadabhiḥ:*  
*kutracit svarayor madhye dvitvam lakshyānusūtrataḥ:*  
*pūrvagamas tathā tatra jñeyo varṇavicakṣhāṇḍāḥ.*  
<sup>44</sup> evamrūpam aniyamam sūcayitūm vyañjanottarayor<sup>45</sup> ity antarārasvīkārah<sup>46</sup>.

*vyañjanam uttarām yābhyaṁ tāu<sup>47</sup> vyañjanottarāu<sup>48</sup>: tayoh.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. put next before *pūrv-*, O. adding *tu*. <sup>2</sup> in O. only <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om.  
<sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *svarapūrvayor*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *vyañjanottarayor*. <sup>6</sup> B. *utaratrāni*; G. M. *uttarasūtrāni*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. O. -*teh*; O. om. *tan*. <sup>8</sup> B. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. -*ti* <sup>10</sup>; G. M. add *tatra*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *sāmhitāsamh-*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *paramani*; O. *uktani*. <sup>12</sup> O. om. <sup>13</sup> O. *tatra*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. -*rasya*. <sup>15</sup> W. O. om. *tad*; B. *gunam*. <sup>16</sup> W. O. *evaṁ*; M. exchanges the places of *eva* and *iti*. <sup>17</sup> O. -*ti* <sup>18</sup> O. om. *sūtra*. <sup>19</sup> O. -*namātrapar-*. <sup>20</sup> G. M. -*ta*; O. puts after *dvitvam*, and adds *iti*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. *nishidhyate*; O. *vijishyate*. <sup>22</sup> W. B. O. *nu*. <sup>23</sup> W. B. *tabr-*. <sup>24</sup> G. M. *yuktah*. <sup>25</sup> W. -*depavīca-ksh-*; G. M. -*na*. <sup>26</sup> O. *abhikshi*. <sup>27</sup> W. B. *apavādāp-*. <sup>28</sup> G. M. nā 'sti *virodha iti*. <sup>29</sup> O. *paramam*. <sup>30</sup> W. om. <sup>31</sup> O. ins. *svarapūrvo*. <sup>32</sup> B. *tu*; O. om. <sup>33</sup> O. *parāv-*. <sup>34</sup> W. -*me*; G. M. -*māu*. <sup>35</sup> B. G. M. ins. *'pi*. <sup>36</sup> G. M. ins. *katham*. <sup>37</sup> W. B. -*mām*. <sup>38</sup> O. om. <sup>39</sup> W. om. <sup>40</sup> O. -*ra*. <sup>41</sup> W. *sauvasya*. <sup>42</sup> G. M. *vaksyate*. <sup>43</sup> G. M. *katham*. <sup>44</sup> O. ins. *ity*. <sup>45</sup> O. *janayor*. <sup>46</sup> G. M. O. *uttarasv-*. <sup>47</sup> G. M. *tad*. <sup>48</sup> G. M. -*rami*.

7. And when *l* precedes.

The *ca*, ‘and,’ here brings down from rule 5 only the fourth mute [the last of the two there mentioned] and the increment. The second mute is not also included, because (see note to rule 2) no second mute occurs after *l* in the Sanhitā. The examples are *pragalbho* (i. e. -*galbbho*) ‘*sya jāyate*’ (ii.5.5<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have *jāyate*), and *namo madhyamdyā cā ’pagalbhāya* (i. e. -*galbh-*) *ca* (iv.5.6<sup>1</sup>)—but, in place of the latter, G. M. give *apagalbho jāyate* (ii.5.5<sup>3</sup>: O. reads *agagalya* simply, which doubtless means the first word of this).

As was remarked above (under rule 3), the laying down of the present precept without any limitation appears to confirm the commentator’s interpretation of rules 2 and 3, as teaching the accepted doctrine of the *čakha*. It would, to be sure, be not impossible to understand *lbh* for *lh* as required here, without any reference to the other groups—*lk*, *lg* etc.—in which the duplication after *l* depends upon the earlier rules; but that seems quite unlikely.

उपसर्गपाथृष्टोऽत्यातिधामपरमभूतेपूर्वेषु ऋखिभुजेषु  
च ॥८॥

8. Also the preceding mute is inserted before *ch*, *khi*, and *bhuja*, when these follow either a preposition, *pātha eshah*, *ati*, *ati*, *dhāma*, *pardma*, or *bhūte*.

The examples after a preposition (in which situation alone the increment of *khi* and *bhuja* is made) are first given by the commentator: they are *ā cchrṇpatti* (v.1.7<sup>4</sup>: the preceding word, *andcchrṇpam*, might well have been included, as an additional instance; my MS. has simple *ch* in both cases); *nama dīkchidate ca prakkhidate ca* (iv.5.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word, G. M. O. the last two); *ayakshnayā paribbhujā* (iv.5.1<sup>4</sup>), with *vibhu ca me prabhu ca me* (iv.7.4<sup>1-2</sup>: O. stops at the first *me*) as counter-example, to show the necessity of saying *bhuja*, instead of *bhu* simply, in the rule; and *yā ca vičandādā* (v.2.11<sup>1</sup>). Then follow counter-examples: first, to show that *kh* is increased only when followed by *i*, *nikhātam manushyāndām* (vi.3.4<sup>6</sup>) and *datsv adhi khādati* (vi.2.11<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *datsv*); next, to show that the increment takes place only after a preposition, *sachandā yā* (v.2.11<sup>1</sup>). The examples after the remaining words, as particularly specified in the rule, are *priyam apy etu pāthah*: *esha cchāgah* (iv.6.8<sup>1</sup>: only O. has *priyam*), with *r̥tuhir vā esha chandobhūtā* (vii.5.15<sup>2</sup>), to prove the need of quoting *pāthah* along with *esha* in the rule; *aticchan-*

---

7. *cakdraç caturthāgamayor*<sup>1</sup> *ākarshakah*: *caturthasparṣe*<sup>2</sup> *la-kārapūrve sati pūrvāgamo bhavati*. *prag-----*: *namo----- la-kārah pūrvo yasmād asdrū<sup>3</sup> lakārapūrvah*: *tasmin*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*gam*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*the sp-* <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *sa*.

that in the Rik Pr. (vi.2) which allows, but does not require, duplication of a mute after the spirants (namely *ç*, *sh*, *s*, *h*, *x*, *φ*, *ñ*). The Ath. Pr. (unless such a precept is lost by the *lacuna* occurring in the treatment of this subject: see note to Ath. Pr. iii. 28) and Pāṇini have nothing similar. Our rule, however, is quite alone so far as the treatment of a nasal after a spirant is concerned, making an insertion of a surd non-aspirate, instead of a nasal: and, as will be seen, the next rule quotes an opinion which would bring the Tāittirīya usage more nearly into accordance with that of the Rik and Vājasaneyi Sanhitās; but the commentator pronounces that opinion unapproved.

The examples quoted are as follows: *yah kāmayeta* (i. e. *yaz kkām-*: ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al.); *acmann* (i. e. *acpmān*, or, after all rules are applied, *acçppmān*) *ārjam* (iv.6.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the example and puts here, instead of below, that for *φ*); *grishme* (i. e. *grishpmē* or *grishshppmē*) *madhyandine* (ii.1.2<sup>5</sup>); *ayasmayam* (i. e. *ayaspmanyam* or *ayassppmayam*) *vi cṛtā bandham* (iv.2.5<sup>3</sup>: only W. has *bandham*); *yah pāpmanā* (i. e. *yao ppā-*: ii.3.13<sup>2</sup>): O. adds to this last *tasmin* (vii.1.5<sup>1</sup> et al.: to be treated like *ayasmayam*, above), and, after *madhyandine*, *prāgnāti* (*prāggītnāti*: I have overlooked this citation in searching out the references). As counter-examples, we have first *garady apardhne* (ii.1.2<sup>5</sup>: but O. substitutes *brahmavādino vudanti*, i.7.1<sup>4</sup> et al.), to show that the sonant spirant, *h*, does not require a like insertion (the case is one of *nāsikya*, xxi. 14); then *rukram upa dadhāti* (v.2.7<sup>1,2</sup>; the case is one for *yanī*, xxi.12), to show that a mute receives the increment only after a spirant; and lastly *ishvā ca vejrena ca* (v.7.3<sup>1</sup>), to show that a mute only is increased after a spirant. For the second of these counter-examples, O. substitutes two of the same character, namely *yum apnavānah* (i.5.5<sup>1</sup>) and *sa pratnavat* (ii.2.12<sup>1</sup> et al.); for the last, it gives (in a passage which has strayed out of place, and got inserted near the end of the comment to rule 10) *agnaye svāhā* (i.2.2<sup>1</sup> et al.).

In all these combinations, *x* and *φ* are exempt from duplication by xiv.15, but the sibilants are doubled, except as some authorities (xiv.17,18) would leave them unchanged.

9. *sparçaparād aghoshād uśmānah paraḥ<sup>1</sup> prathama<sup>2</sup> ḍgumas<sup>3</sup> tasya spureasya sasthānah<sup>4</sup> samdnasthāno 'bhinidhāno bhuvati abhinidhīyatū<sup>5</sup> ity abhinidhānah: ḍropauñya ity arthaḥ: 'vedāntare tasyā' 'bhāvād atrā "ropauñiyatvam. yathā<sup>6</sup>: yah----: āgm----: grish----: ayasm----: yuh---- aghoshād iti kim: garady---- uśmāna iti kim: 'rukram----' sparçaparād iti kim: ishvā----*

*sūtram idum eve 'shtam: na tatparadravayam<sup>10</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *pratham*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -mo bhavati. <sup>4</sup> B. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. -dhāyata; B. -niyata. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *vedāntarasyā*; O. -rena tad a. <sup>7</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>8</sup> O. om. <sup>9</sup> O. *yam agnavañnah: sa pratnavat*, and om. all that follows (but see various readings to next rule). <sup>10</sup> G. M. *tu par-*

13<sup>2</sup>), and *âspâtram juhûr devânâm* (ii.5.9<sup>3</sup>: G. M. have only the first word). All these are examples quite needless to be given, as they are read by Plâkshi precisely as prescribed by the preceding rule. Counter-examples, exhibiting his discordant view, are *kûcmân chakabhih* (v.7.23: W. G. M. have *kûcmân* only, and B. reads *kûshmândân*, which I have not found in the Sanhitâ, although *kûcmânda* occurs in the Taitt. Âranyaka, at ii.7.8) and *akshnayâ vyâghârayati* (v.2.7<sup>5</sup> et al.: given only by W. B., and introduced out of place, between *nîsh tapâmi* and *doshâvastâh*, above).

O. follows an independent course in the interpretation and illustration of this rule. It calls the insertion an *abhinidhâna* (though adding at the end “there is no obligation of *abhinidhâna*”) and, for the examples *yah kâmayeta* to *âspâtram*, it substitutes *sucandra dasma vicpate havyavât* (iv.4.4<sup>6</sup>: the MS. omits *dasma*), *yac chandasâm* (the thing nearest to this that I have found in the text is *prajâpatîc chandasâm*, iii.8.7<sup>1</sup>), *naç cid ati* (this I have overlooked in searching out the references), *sûtram* (doubtless meant for *âspâtram*), and *bṛhaspatisûrapate* (probably *bṛhaspatisutasya te*, i.4.27).

The present precept was pronounced unapproved in the comment to rule 9.

## उत्तमपरात् प्राक्तायणस्य ॥ ११ ॥

11. But according to Plâkshâyaña, on the contrary, when the following mute is a nasal.

This can only mean to teach the precise opposite of the preceding rule; or, that there is no insertion when a surd mute follows the spirant, but only when a nasal follows. And it is first so explained by the commentator, who gives as examples *akshnayâ vyâghârayati* (v.2.7<sup>5</sup> et al.), *agnâti* (i.6.7<sup>3</sup> et al.), and *tîrthe snâti*

11. *'plâkshâyanasya tu paksha uttamaparâd aghoshâd ushmanah parah' prathamâgamo bhavati. yathâ: akshñ-....: agnâti: tîrthe-.... uttamaparâd iti kim: nish-....: 'yah k-....: 'yah p-....: pagedt. tuçabdah plâksheh paksham prakshipati'.*

*kecid evam ûcuh: aghoshatvam ushmanas tuçabdo nivartayati ti'. tatrâ 'yam sâtrârthaḥ: uttamapardt tu' ghoshavata' ushmanah parah prathamâgamo bhavati. ahnâm-....: carady-....: brahm-....: ghoshavata' iti kim: agmâ-....: grish-....: ayas-....*

<sup>1)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3)</sup> B. om. <sup>4)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5)</sup> W. apakshiyâti; B. kshiyati. <sup>6)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7)</sup> in W. only. <sup>8)</sup> G. M. ghoeshâd. <sup>9)</sup> G. M. agh.

O. substitutes for the whole comment *aghoshaprakriyam tuçabde nirayati: plâkshâyanasya câkhino mate aghoshâd ushmanah uttamasparsaporât: sasthâneprathamaugamo bhavati: aksh-....: gri-....: gnâti: ayas-....*

*savituh* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> et al.). As counter-examples, we have *tāh* (i. e. *tās*, ix.2) *sañrohah* (v.3.6<sup>3</sup>: omitted by O.; dropped out in W. B.) and *vāk ta ā pyāyatām* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup>: only O. has the last two words), in which no aspiration takes place.

A possible difficulty in the application of this rule is noticed and removed by O. alone. Such a case as *arvāk : hi : enam : parāih* (vi.3.3<sup>1</sup>) might seem to fall under its action, the spirant *h* following a surd mute. But it is pointed out that, in virtue of v.38, *h* becomes a fourth mute by special prescription; and hence that rule viii.3 alone applies to the preceding surd, changing it to a sonant.

The place of introduction of this precept and the following—coming in, as they do, right in the midst of the rules respecting duplication, with which they stand in no relation—is quite surprising and objectionable. The commentator, however, passes the matter without notice.

I have not noted any case in which my manuscript of the Sanhitā attempts the aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, as here required. The manuscripts of the commentary, however, which almost never heed the rules for duplication, even in illustrating those rules themselves, often (as we have repeatedly had occasion to notice) observe this one in their citations, although they yet more often neglect it (thus, in the examples here given, G. M. O. aspirate the mutes, and W. B. leave them unchanged). Being taught in company with the duplication, as part of the *varna-krama*, it has no claim to be taken account of in the construction of an ordinary Tāittirīya text. Respecting the teachings of the other Prātiçāhyas upon the subject, see the note to Ath. Pr. ii.6.

### बाढभीकारस्यासस्थानपरः ॥ १३ ॥

13. According to Bādabhikāra, when the following spirant is not of the same position with it.

Rule ii.44 teaches the accordance of the several (surd) spirants, in their order, with the series of mutes, in point of position—more literally, of place of production.

T. calls the individual here referred to Bādavikāra, and W. O. have in the rule *vādabhikāra*, but in the comment *bādabh-*; the rest have uniformly *b* as initial letter, which I have therefore adopted, as being decidedly better supported than *v*. Weber gives the two forms *vādabh-* (V. Pr. p. 250) and *vātabh-* (ib., p. 78).

13. *bādabhikārasya*<sup>1</sup> *mata ḍtmano*<sup>2</sup> *'sasthānoshmaparah prathamah savargiyam*<sup>3</sup> *dvitiyam ḍpadyate*. *'samānarām sthānām yasyā* *'śdu sasthānah*: *na sasthāno* *'sasthānah*: *sa paro yasmāt sa tatho* *'ktāh*. *yathā*<sup>5</sup>: *vis----*: *tat----*<sup>4</sup> *asasthāna iti kim: tat----*<sup>6</sup>.

*ne 'dam sūtram ishtam.*

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *çākhino*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. (and begin the next word *as-*). <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. om. <sup>6</sup> O. ins. *idard(?)sthāno yam sakārah.*

precedes *ksh*, since elsewhere it can stand only in *pausā*. *Jihvā-mūliya* occurs (by the conversion of final *h* according to ix.2) in the groups *zh*, *zkl*, *zkr*, *zksh*, *zkshñ*, *zkhv*, and *zkh*; *upadhmāniya*, in like manner, in *qp*, *qpy*, *qpr*, *qpl*, and *qph*: the combinations of *r* have been enumerated above (under rule 4).

The other Prātiçākhyas have rules equivalent with this, into the variety of expression of which we do not need to enter.

It is to be accounted as a reprehensible omission on the part of our treatise, that it gives no direction as to the treatment of a group beginning with *anusvāra*. The Vāj. Prāt. (iv.10<sup>7</sup>) expressly exempts *anusvāra* from duplication; and, in the Rik Prāt., in the fundamental rule (vi.1), *anusvāra* is ruled out of account in the estimation of consonant groups, it being taught that a consonant is doubled after it in the same manner as after a vowel. There is no good reason to doubt that the same is to be understood as the doctrine of the present work, and that it would have *anusvāra*, so far as duplication is concerned, deemed and taken as merely an affection of the vowel to which it is attached. That this is not explicitly stated, stands in connection with the equivocal position of the Tātt. Prāt. in reference to the nature of *anusvāra* (see p. 68): according to the view taken at the beginning of the next chapter (xv.1), rules respecting it are no more required than in the Ath. Prāt., where they are equally wanting.

The commentator notices that some would read the rule now under discussion as two, cutting off *avasāne* from the rest; and for the reason that otherwise, as the rule stands, it seems natural to understand that “*r*, *h*, *z*, and *q*, when standing before a pause,” are not doubled; as a similar construction was made in rule 10 of the fifth chapter. But he denies the validity of the objection, since duplication of *r* and the rest before a pause is not in the remotest

<sup>1</sup> *avasāna iti* : <sup>2</sup> *caturñdīn varṇānām* <sup>3</sup> *prthag eva sūtrām* <sup>4</sup> *kecid  
ucuh* : <sup>5</sup> *ekikarane* <sup>6</sup> *doshadarçanāt* : *ashū*<sup>10</sup> *doshah* : *avasāne var-*  
*tamānā rephavisarjanīyādaya*<sup>11</sup> *ity anvayasampādanam*<sup>12</sup> : *av-*  
*agraha* *acīr dhūh suvar* (v.10) *itivad iti cet*<sup>13</sup> : *nāi* *'sha* *do-*  
*shah* : *ravisarjanīyādīnām*<sup>14</sup> *padāvasāne* <sup>15</sup> *dvitvaprāpti*<sup>16</sup> *dūrot-*  
*sārite*<sup>17</sup> *'ti ne* *'yam* *atra* *çankā* *'sti*<sup>18</sup> : *avasāne* *prthukkarane*<sup>19</sup> *saty*<sup>20</sup>  
*avasāne*<sup>15</sup> *kiñ vā bhavati* *'ti* *sākṣiñkhatayā*<sup>21</sup> *vacanam anarthu-*  
*kañ*<sup>22</sup> *syat* : *ekikarane* *tu* *ravisarjanīyetivarnasāhacaryād*<sup>23</sup> *avu-*  
*sāne* *vartumāno* *varṇa* *iti*<sup>24</sup> *labhyate* : *tasmād ekikaranām eva*  
*ramañyam*.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. *yad.* <sup>2</sup> W. B. combine, as in rule. <sup>3</sup> O. om. *ca*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -dyeran. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -āna *iti v-*. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *kecid idāni sūtrām prthag evo "cuh* : *avasāna iti ca* : *ravisarjanīyajihvāmūliyopadhāmāniyā iti ca* : *kothām prthakkaranām*. <sup>8</sup> W. *caturvāñdh*; B. om. *varṇānām*. <sup>9</sup> W. corrupt. <sup>10</sup> G. M. O. *ko 'sāu*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. O. *ravi-*; B. *-niyā*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *anayavavasāmbhāvanam*; O. *asya dvitvām samip-*. <sup>13</sup> O. om. <sup>14</sup> O. *avasāne* *vyatirikta* *sthalē vis-*. <sup>15</sup> B. om. <sup>16</sup> W. *rephaprāptih*. <sup>17</sup> W. *tatsid-*; O. *dūrotat-*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *kiñ cit*; O. *kiñ ca*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. O. *prth-*. <sup>20</sup> W. *sti*; G. M. *nisti*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. *-kshā tathā*; O. *-kshayā*. <sup>22</sup> B. *arth-*. <sup>23</sup> W. *savis-*; B. *vis-*; O. om. *varṇa*. <sup>24</sup> O. om.

## प्रथमपरश्च प्रान्तिप्रान्तायणयोः ॥ १७ ॥

17. Or, according to Plâkshi and Plâkshâyaña, when followed by a first mute.

That is to say, these two *çakhaṇā* would leave a spirant free from duplication before an unaspirated surd mute, contrary to the first rule of the chapter. The groups which would be thus affected are *gc* and *gcy*, *gp*, *shk* and *shky* and *shkr*, *shṭ* and its further combinations (*shṭy*, *shṭr*, *shṭv*), *shp*, *sk*, *st* and its further combinations (*stm*, *sty*, *str* and *stry*, *stv*), and *sp*. One hardly sees why combinations with a second mute (namely *gh* and *gchy*, *shkh*, *shṭh* and *shṭhy*, *sth* and *sthn*, *sph* and *sphy*) should not be subject to the same rule—but then, one must not expect to see the reason of anything whatever, general rule or particular exception, in this doctrine of duplications. It may be made a question whether the single case, *rshṭ*, falling under rule 4 is not also here aimed at; if the pair of kinsmen did not overlook it, it is doubtless included with the rest.

The examples (which are lost in W.) are *succandra dasma* (iv. 4.4<sup>6</sup>: O. omits *dasma*) and *ashtau kṛtvah* (vi.4.5<sup>1</sup>); a counter-example, with a last mute after the spirant, is *tasmād evāṁ vidushā* (vi.4.9<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *vidushā*); but O. has, with B., omitted to point out that this is a counter-example, and gives further, as such, *ishvā ca vajrena* (v.7.3<sup>1</sup>).

The commentator then goes on to say that although the word *ca*, ‘or,’ in the rule brings down by implication a spirant pure and simple (without exclusion of any sound belonging to that class), yet the real application is only to *g*, *sh*, *s*, and *h*, since otherwise the mention of *χ* and *φ* in rule 15 would be without meaning, their exception being assured by the present precept. The interpretation is doubtless true, but the reason given for it is only acceptable on the supposition that what is here put forward as the view of two individual authorities is in fact the accepted doctrine of the Prâticâkhyâ; in any other case, there is no inconsistency or interference between rules 15 and 17, and the commentator should rather have said that, as the pair of dissidents doubtless accepted

17. *plâkshiplâkshâyanayoh pakshe<sup>1</sup> prathamapara uśhmâ dvitvâṁ nā "padyate. cakâra uśhmâṇam arvâdiçati. succ----: ashtau----. <sup>3</sup>prathamapara iti kim: <sup>3</sup> tasmâd----<sup>2</sup> prathamâ paro yasmâd aslu prathamaparah. <sup>4</sup> cakâro 'tra<sup>5</sup> yady apy<sup>6</sup> uśhmamâtrâkarshakas' tathâ 'pi<sup>8</sup> ga-shasaheshv eva sampratyayah: anyathâ<sup>9</sup> vasâne ravisarjanîya (xiv.15) iti<sup>10</sup> sâtre jihvâmâlyopadhmâniyuyor gruhânain vyartham: anendi<sup>11</sup> 'va nishedhasiddhah<sup>12</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> O. mate. <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. ins. *prathamapara iti kim: ishvā----*  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>6</sup> W. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *uśhmâk-* <sup>8</sup> W. O. *h*- <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> W. O. om. <sup>11</sup> O. ins. *shâi*. <sup>12</sup> W. O. *-shedhe s-*.

Rules 18–22 are pronounced unapproved under rule 22.

## रेपपरश्च कृकारः ॥ १६ ॥

19. Nor *h*, when followed by *r*.

The word *ca* in the rule is declared to continue the implication of “according to Hârîta.” This individual having in the former rule limited his denial of duplication to a surd spirant, and so left the sonant spirant *h* (? the MSS. say “a surd spirant”) liable to be always doubled, it is now taught that *h* with the distinctive mark of a following *r* remains single. The example given, alike in all MSS., is *duduhre ahrayah* (i.5.5<sup>1</sup>); counter-examples are *juhve* (i. e. *juhhve*) *hy agnis tvâ ”hvayati* (i.1.12: G. M. end with *agnih*; W. B. omit altogether, along with the introductory explanation to the next citation), to show that *h* would be doubled by Hârîta before any other letter than *r*; and *gukram* (i. e. *gukkram*) *te anyat* (iv.1.11<sup>2</sup>: O. omits), to show that any other letter than *h* would be doubled before *r*.

O., though using two of the citations given by the other MSS., has a wholly independent exposition of this rule.

## टवर्गश्च तवर्गपरः ॥ २० ॥

20. Nor a lingual mute, when followed by a dental.

That is to say, in the opinion of Hârîta. Thus, in *vashat te vishno* (ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>: O. has *vishat te vikshave*, but it is doubtless only a corrupt reading) and *vid dravînam* (i.8.13<sup>1</sup> et al.), Hârîta would leave the groups *tt* and *ddr* untouched, while the rules of the treatise would require *ttt* and *ddd*. The other groups in which he would teach the simpler combination are *ttr*, *dd*, *ddhr*, and *r̥t̥*; and *ts*, *tsv* and *rts* would fall indirectly under the same exception, since, by v.33, *t* (converted to *th* by xiv.12) must be inserted between *t* and *s*: *ts*, then, would in Hârîta’s hands become *tths*; in those of the regular adherents of this school, *ttths*. Counter-examples, of obvious application, are *vâk te* (i. e. *vâkk te*; i.3.9<sup>1</sup>: wanting in B. O.), *tat te* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup> et al.: found in W. only, and of no

19. *pūrvam uśmā 'ghosha ity ukte' 'ghoshoshinayo nityanī dvitîye prâpte "viçishtâ idânum<sup>2</sup> rephaparo hâkâra<sup>3</sup> cakârâkrshita-hâritamate dvitvam nâ "padyate. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: dud----- rephupara iti kim: juhv----- hakâra iti kim<sup>5</sup>: çukram----- rephah paro yasmâd asâu rephaparah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. a. <sup>2</sup> W. *viçeshtâdinâm*; B. *viçishtâividanam*; G. M. *viçinashî id-*  
<sup>3</sup> W. *-re*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> W. B. om.

O. substitutes *cakabdo hâritasyâ 'nvâdeçakah*: *hâritasya çâkhino mate rephaparo hakâro dvivânam âpadyate. dud----- rephapara iti kim: juhv-----*

20. *cakâro<sup>1</sup> hâritânvâdeçakah<sup>2</sup>: <sup>3</sup> tavargas tavargaparo na dvitvam âpadyate. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: "vashat-----<sup>5</sup> vid----- "tavarga<sup>6</sup> paro*

duplication has been once performed, it is not done over again, as otherwise the process would go on *ad infinitum*. And if it be objected that rule 23 sufficiently forbids this repeated duplication, and that this one would therefore be an unnecessary repetition, the answer is made that that is no fault, since the matter in hand is a division of opinions—that is to say, doubtless, that here Hārīta's view only is concerned, and so there is no necessary connection between the two rules.

Fortunately, the commentator is able to add that the present precept, along with its four predecessors, is to be ruled out of account as unapproved, so that what it means is of very little consequence.

### सवर्णसवर्गीयिपर् ॥ २३ ॥

23. A letter followed by one homogeneous with itself, or one of the same mute-series, is not duplicated.

By *savarna*, ‘of like color or sound,’ we are told, is signified identity of form, not merely correspondence as regards place and organ of production. The difference is, that the latter description would apply to the spirants, in their relation to the series of mutes (ii.44,45), and it is not the usage of this school to exempt the spirants (except *χ* and *φ*, rule 15) from duplication, even before a mute with which they are akin. The Ath. Pr. (iii.30) does so exempt them. The epithet *savarna*, then, applies only to an identical letter and to the nasal semivowels into which (by v.26,28) *n* and *m* are converted before *y*, *l*, and *v*.

The cited examples of the application of the rule to homogeneous sounds are *atvakkāya* (vii.5.12<sup>2</sup>), *attā havīñshi* (ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>), *pippakā te garavyāyādi* (v.5.19: only O. has the last word), *samyattāh*.

---

22. *cakāro hāritākarshakah*<sup>1</sup>: *para ity ekavacanena*<sup>2</sup> *rakāro*<sup>3</sup> *grhyate*: *pūrvasūtrasthanimittayoh*<sup>4</sup> *so 'pi*<sup>5</sup> *na dvitram īpad-*  
*yate. yathā: vi-*<sup>6</sup> *.... rakāra iti kim: kalpān-*<sup>7</sup> *.... sparça*<sup>8</sup> *ev āi 'keshām ācāryāñām* (xiv.3) *ity 'atrā 'radhā-*  
*rajanirākarānyād 'yam' ārāmbhaḥ. athavā*<sup>9</sup>: *taddvitve*<sup>10</sup> *kṛte pu-*  
*ro dvitiyapuryāyo*<sup>11</sup> *dvitvavidhir nā 'sti*<sup>12</sup>: *anarasthāprasañgāt.*  
*nanu savarṇasavargiyapara* (xiv.23) *iti parasūtrend*<sup>13</sup> *'pi*  
*punardvitvanishedhah*: <sup>14</sup> *'pūnaruptyam mā bhād iti*<sup>15</sup>: *mata-*  
*bhedān nāi 'sha*<sup>16</sup> *dosha iti brāhmaḥ.*

*hāritamatād*<sup>16</sup> *ūshma* *'ghosha* (xiv.18) *ityādisūtrapañca-*  
*kaṁ*<sup>17</sup> *anishtam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*tamatāk-*. <sup>2</sup> W. *eva v-*. <sup>3</sup> W. *sav-*, and puts after *grhyate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *parah*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *hāritamate*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -*para*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *evāndhā-...-nāyāyā* *'yam*. <sup>8</sup> W. B. *yathā*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. *tad*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. -*dyena*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. -*dhin na* *prāp-*  
*noti*. <sup>12</sup> W. -om. *para*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. ins. *tasmāt*. <sup>14</sup> W. -*ktyo mā bhavati*; G. M.  
-*ktyam āvahati*. <sup>15</sup> W. *va*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. -*mate*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. *ityādī paraç ce* *tyantāñ*  
*sū-*. O. wanting (see above).

restrictions to the sphere of duplication, as there are somewhat over a hundred consonant groups to which it applies.

## नानुत्तम उत्तमपरः ॥ २४ ॥

24. Unless, indeed, it be a non-nasal followed by a nasal.

This is a precept of counter-exception, contravening in part the exceptions established by the foregoing rule. Examples are *yācñā* (i.5.7<sup>4</sup>: the only example of this combination which the text affords), *yajñe-yajñe* (iii.1.11<sup>2</sup>: but O. has *yajñena*, vi.5.3<sup>1</sup> et al.), *ātnārah* (v.6.5<sup>3</sup>: also the sole instance), *su pratnavat* (ii.2.12<sup>1</sup> et al.: in O. only), and *pāpmānām* (i.4.41 et al.): a counter-example is *tam mā devāḥ* (iii.3.2<sup>2</sup>: wanting in O.).

The cases here denied exemption from duplication are those in which, according to xxi.12, *yama* is introduced between the two mutes. According to the Vāj. Prāt. (iv.111), *yama* suspends duplication.

## अथेकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ २५ ॥

25. Now for the views of certain teachers.

A simple heading for the rules that follow, in force as far as rule 28 inclusive—or, according to the commentator's interpretation of rule 28, through 27 only.

## लकारो लृशवकारपरः ॥ २६ ॥

26. A *l* is not doubled when followed by *h*, *ç*, or *v*.

The commentator's examples are *malhā ā labhanta* (ii.1.2<sup>4</sup>: but B. O. have *-bheta*, which is found in the same division, and G. M. read *-bhate*, which is doubtless a corruption of the same), *catalavalco vi roha* (i.3.5 and vi.3.3<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *vi roha*), and *tato bīlvāḥ* (ii.1.8<sup>2</sup>: O. substitutes *bālvo yāpah*, ii.1.8<sup>1</sup>); his counter-examples (omitted in O.) are *kalmāshī* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>) and *kalyāñī* (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>).

This rule, we are told, determines the usage of the school so far as the combinations *lh* and *lc* are concerned, but not in the case of

24. *nakāro 'yam pratiprasavārthaḥ*<sup>1</sup>: *\*uttamaparo 'nuttamo dvitvam āpadhyate. yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *yācñā*: *yaj-----: ātnārah*: *\*sa-----:*<sup>4</sup> *pāpmānām*. *\*anuttama uttamapara iti kim: tam-----*<sup>5</sup> *uttamah paro yasmād asāv*<sup>2</sup> *uttamaparah. savarnasavargīyapara*<sup>6</sup> (xiv.23) *iti pratishedhaprāptāv ayam drambhāḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *prāvārtha*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> in O. only. <sup>5</sup> O. om.; B. om. *anuttama*; W. om. *uttama*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. *para*.

25. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: ekeshām*<sup>1</sup> *mate*<sup>2</sup> *kriyata*<sup>3</sup> *ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttarām yad vakshyāmaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ācāryāñām*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *matam*; O. *mācītam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *adhikri-*

this as the accepted doctrine of the school, and as determining the reading in this *çākhā*. How this strange result is arrived at, we have to follow through his lengthy exposition closely enough to discover.

In the first place, *vyañjanapara*, ‘followed by a consonant,’ is declared to mean ‘followed by any other consonant than a mute,’ because otherwise, as we have read ‘followed by a mute’ in the preceding rule, the treatise would be guilty of a needless repetition so far as sequence by a mute is concerned. To this the natural answer would be that the two rules do not come into collision, since they do not occupy the same ground: the former relates to any mute in any situation, the latter only to an unaltered mute at the end of a word; and if the one is declared to have a single pronunciation before a mute only, the other before any consonant whatever, what objection can possibly be taken? Moreover, we are stating here the views of certain authorities, of whom one set might hold rule 27, and the other rule 28: and even if they partly covered one another, there would be nothing wrong about it. Once more, *sparçapara* is claimed to be implied here merely for the purpose of denying it, the commentator’s conclusion being that there is duplication of *n* before a mute, though not before a semi-vowel; and that is certainly a very remarkable kind of *anuvṛtti* which should work thus by contraries. Of the last two considerations, the commentator takes no notice (although he has once appealed to the former of them in a somewhat similar case above, under rule 22): the first he states and replies to. It may be objected, he says, that there is a difference of affecting cause laid down in consequence of the difference of the affected letter; the latter is here qualified as final and as original; and the former as being any consonant whatever. Nevertheless, he claims, there would be meaninglessness of the qualification of the affecting cause,

28. *vyañjanapara iti sparçavyatirikta*<sup>1</sup> *vyañjanapara ity arthaḥ:*  
*anyathā sparçānām api grahaṇe pūrvasūtre 'pi sparça'*<sup>2</sup> *ity ukta-*  
*tvat pārunaruktyam syāt.* *nanu nimittaviçeshān<sup>3</sup> nimittaviçesho<sup>4</sup>*  
*'sti: padāntatvam prākṛtatvam ca nimittino<sup>5</sup> viçeshā<sup>6</sup> nimittasya*  
*tu sarvavyañjanātmakatvam<sup>7</sup>:* *iti cet: tathā 'pi sparçabhdāgē'*<sup>8</sup> *ni-*  
*mittaviçeshasya<sup>9</sup> vāiyarthyam<sup>10</sup>:* *sparçapara ity*<sup>11</sup> *atra sāmānyenā*  
*'pi<sup>12</sup> nimittaviçeshasya<sup>13</sup> vigatatuval<sup>14</sup>:* *tasmād<sup>15</sup> antasthādaya evā*  
*'tra vyāñjanaçabdeno 'cyante.* <sup>16</sup>*cakāro yady api sparçānātrā-*  
*karshakas tathā 'pi pārīgeshyān<sup>17</sup> nakārasyā 'nukarshayam<sup>18</sup>:*  
*tathā hi: antasthādivyāñjanaparative 'nyaspargānām<sup>19</sup> avikṛtā-*  
*nām padānte sthitir nā 'sti: samrād ity atrā 'stī 'ti cet: mādi*  
*'vam: na sañ sām iti<sup>20</sup> rāpara (xiii.4) ity atra vāiyarthyāt<sup>21</sup>:*  
*itiçabdo makārasya dvitvasadbhāvam bodhayati 'ty<sup>22</sup> adhyayanā-*  
*nurodhād upapāditam: tasmān nāi 'sha nishedhavishayah.* <sup>23</sup>*nā*  
*'pi brahmañvantah: nyān---- ityādivishayah:<sup>24</sup> kutah: iha*

The authority of Māhisheya (see note to the introductory verses, p. 7) is further appealed to as making the same restriction of implication. His explanation is that, in the view of some teachers, a final unaltered *n* followed by a semivowel or spirant is not doubled. Examples are *mitro janān yātayati* (iii.4.11<sup>5</sup>: only G. M. have *mitro*), *omanvatī te* (ii.6.9<sup>5</sup>; p. *oman-vatī*), and *etān homān* (i.5.4<sup>4</sup>); in all which we are to understand that the *n* remains single. On the other hand, there is duplication in *anyā* (i. e. *annyā*) *yanti* (ii. 5.12<sup>2</sup>) and *anv* (i. e. *annv*) *aha māsād* (i.7.13<sup>1</sup>), where the *n* is not final; in *tān* (i. e. *tānn*) *kalpayati* (v.3.1<sup>2</sup>) and *imān* (i. e. *imānn*) *bhadrān* (i.6.3<sup>1</sup>), where the *n* is followed by a mute; and also in *tān rakshadhwam* (i.2.7) and *vāishnavān rakshoharāh* (i.3.2<sup>2</sup>), where, it is asserted, the *n* does not maintain its original form. Since, however, there is no rule in the Prātiçākhya for altering a *n* in this last pair of cases, the commentator quotes (from the same authority, we may conjecture, which has been recently twice appealed to, under rules 23 and 26) a prescription to the effect that *n* when preceding a *r* or an *r*-vowel, or when following a lingual (the MSS. say, a dental) mute, is uttered in the lingual position: thus, he says, in virtue of its change of position, the *n* is phonetically altered. Finally, he makes an alleged citation from the Çikshā (not found in the version known to us), which teaches that a final *n* preceding *r* exhibits a peculiarity, and is liable to duplication. Such a modification of the utterance of *n* forms no part of the phonetic system of any of the Prātiçākhyas.

Thus is brought to an end the tedious subject of duplication, the physical foundation of which is of the obscurest, although the pains with which the Hindu gākhinsh have elaborated it, and the earnestness with which they assert their discordant views respecting it, prove that it had for them a real, or what seemed like a real, value.

*çikshā cāi 'vām vakshyati :*

<sup>43</sup> *rephāt pūrvo<sup>43</sup> nakārō yah padūnte<sup>44</sup> yatra<sup>45</sup> dr̄gyate :*  
*vigesham tatra jānīyād dvitvam ity<sup>46</sup> abhidhīyate.*

<sup>47</sup> *vyañjanam asmāt<sup>48</sup> param iti<sup>48</sup> vyañjanaparāh : prakṛtiḥ<sup>49</sup>*  
*svabhāvah : tatsambandhī prākṛtaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> O. -çapara. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -itavaçān; O. -tianimittav-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -viçishṭo 'py artho; O. nāmittikariçesho 'py a-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -tto. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. -shah. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -kam. <sup>7</sup> G. M. -çavibh-. <sup>8</sup> G. M. -çishte 'syā. <sup>9</sup> O. -rthyē. <sup>10</sup> O. avyañjanasāmānye; G. M. om. api. <sup>11</sup> G. M. -syā; O. -sha. <sup>12</sup> G. M. 'pi g-; O. pag-. <sup>13</sup> O. om. <sup>14</sup> W. B. cakāra sparçaksharapāri-; G. M. cakārasthānisparçakshakah pariçeshyan. <sup>15</sup> B. takārā-karshunām. <sup>16</sup> G. M. O. saty any-. <sup>17</sup> G. M. ina tu. <sup>18</sup> G. M. om. <sup>19</sup> W. om. iti. <sup>20</sup> W. om. <sup>21</sup> W. -āve. <sup>22</sup> G. M. om. <sup>23</sup> B. svarasya. <sup>24</sup> W. B. nak-. <sup>25</sup> W. dak-; B. om. <sup>26</sup> O. -divyañjanap-. <sup>27</sup> W. -sākal-. <sup>28</sup> O. -ddhev-. <sup>29</sup> O. om.; B. G. M. tatradī 'vām s-; G. M. -tre yo-. <sup>30</sup> O. ins. dācāryānām. <sup>31</sup> W. -sthāvy-. <sup>32</sup> O. om. <sup>33</sup> W. a-. <sup>34</sup> W. O. av-; B. v-; G. M. rav-. <sup>35</sup> all the MSS. tav-. <sup>36</sup> G. M. na-. <sup>37</sup> W. B. O. tav-. <sup>38</sup> W. O. ata sth-; G. M. asthāne. <sup>39</sup> G. M. om. <sup>40</sup> O. -da; G. M. -dat-. <sup>41</sup> G. M. om. <sup>42</sup> O. ins. astī. <sup>43</sup> all but O. rephap-. <sup>44</sup> W. G. -to. <sup>45</sup> G. M. yadi. <sup>46</sup> B. om. <sup>47</sup> O. ins. cakiro kanasyarçakshakah. <sup>48</sup> W. paro. <sup>49</sup> G. M. O. -tir iti.

For an exposition of the place and value of the enclitic circumflex in the Hindu accentual system, see the note to Ath. Pr. iii. 65. It may doubtless admit of question whether the Hindu phonetists, in noting the syllable naturally grave as being otherwise than grave when immediately preceded by an acute, would not have apprehended it better, and described it more truly, as a middle tone between acute and grave, rather than a combination (i.40) of acute and grave. Arguments drawn from the analogies of the Greek and Latin accentual systems (see F. Misteli, in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, vol. xvii., 1868; also Prof. J. Hadley, in the *Proceedings* of the Am. Oriental Society for Oct. 1869 [Journal, vol. ix., pp. lxii.-lxiii.]) may press upon us this latter view as the more plausible. But that any one having access to the sources of knowledge upon the subject should dispute the substantial identity in physical character of the Greek circumflex and the Sanskrit independent *svarita*, and should set down the latter as a "middle tone," in the face of all authority and of all sound phonetic theory, savors of inexcusable carelessness or prejudice.

### **व्यञ्जनातहितो ऽपि ॥ ३० ॥**

30. Even when consonants intervene.

For the necessity of this explicit statement, see the note on the preceding rule. The commentator, having already given under the latter several cases in which the affected and the affecting vowel were separated by one or more consonants, has nothing that is new to offer; but he quotes, nevertheless, *tád agne aññó bhuvámi* (iii. 3.8<sup>2</sup>: B. O. omit *bhuvámi*) and *yás tvá hr̥dā'* (i.4.46<sup>1</sup>): in the first case, *ag-* and *bha-* are circumflexed; in the second, *tvá*.

### **नोदातस्वरितपरः ॥ ३१ ॥**

31. Not, however, when an acute or circumflex follows.

That is to say, the syllable naturally unaccented or grave—but which, coming next after an acute, would usually take, by rule 29 the tone of transition from higher to lower pitch—retains its low or grave tone if immediately followed by an acute, or by a (*nitya* or independent, of course) circumflex, of which the first element is acute: the pitch of voice is governed by the following tone in preference to the preceding, and sinks at once, without perceptible movement of transfer, to the level of *anudáttā*, as a vantage ground from which to rise to the immediately succeeding high point.

In this rule, as well as that to which it constitutes an exception

30. *vyañjanāntarhito*<sup>1</sup> 'py udāttat puro 'nudāttah svuritam  
āpadyate. *yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *tad-----: yas---- 'ity adi*'. *anturhito* *vya*  
*vahita* *ity arthaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> O. ant. <sup>2</sup> B. -tatvam. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> O. om.

According to the majority of MSS. of the comment, the denial of these skeptical people is not limited to the enclitic *svarita*, but extends to the whole accent, in all its seven forms (xx.1-8). Thus, namely; in the *brāhmaṇa* of the Vājasaneyins (that is to say, the Catapatha-Brāhmaṇa) there are only two accents, the acute and the grave. But O. has once more a version of its own, stating that the authorities here referred to would not, like Āgniveṣyāyana, annul rule 31 simply, but would also deny the rules in general for the enclitic circumflex, as in *sá idhānāḥ* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>) and *prapā'* (? MS. *prathā*) *asi* (ii.5.12<sup>4</sup>). We cannot well hesitate to prefer the latter interpretation; there has been no question here of the independent circumflex, and a denial of its existence would be altogether out of place and impertinent. Nor is the reference to the Catapatha-Brāhmaṇa one at all likely to have been intended by the Prātiçākhya. And it is not true, except so far as the mode of designating the accents is concerned, that that treatise has no circumflex accent: it writes, to be sure, only the *anudatta* sign, so that, if the value of this were the same as in the other usual systems of designation, all its syllables would be either grave or acute: and on this foundation, later Hindu systematists have declared them such, and painfully elaborated an exposition of them (see Weber's Ind. Studien, x. 397 ff.).

Rules 32 and 33 are, naturally enough, declared unapproved; but to us it is both interesting and important to find that there were Hindu phonetists in the ancient time who did not admit such an element of utterance as the enclitic circumflex.

## CHAPTER XV.

CONTENTS: 1-3. násalization of vowels, or insertion of *anusvāra*, in cases of the loss or alteration of *n* or *m*; 4-5, the same, in the cases detailed in the next chapter; 6-8, the same, in the case of certain finals; 9, utterance in monotone.

33. *na kevalam udāttāt paraḥ*: *kim tu sarva eva saptarividha-svarito nā' sti 'ty eke çākhino manyante. tathā hi: vājasaneyi-brāhmaṇe<sup>1</sup> dvāv eva svarāu: udāttāc cā 'nudāttāc ca.*

*ne 'dam sūtradvayam<sup>2</sup> iṣṭam.*

O. substitutes *eke çākhino manyante na kevalānudāttāt udāttāsariṣṭaparaḥ*: *prati-shidhyati kīm tarhi udāttakapūrvakaç ca: sa----: prathā---- ne 'dam etc.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhya-vivarane  
caturdaço<sup>3</sup> 'dhydyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *vājanepibrā-*; B. *-nehibr-*; G. M. *-neyabr-*. <sup>2</sup> W. *-tram*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *dvitiye prāñe dvitiyo*.

This is a mere introduction to the next rule, which informs us what the doctrine is which these dissidents hold instead. The commentator pronounces it the approved doctrine for this çākhā.

### ततस्वनुस्वारः ॥३॥

3. And claim that, on the contrary, *anusvāra* is inserted after the vowel.

The *anusvāra* here prescribed is called by the commentator an *āgama*, ‘increment.’ Its insertion is the alternative view to the nasalization of the vowel, and, as is pointed out, is held where that nasalization is denied—of which denial, the *tu*, ‘on the contrary,’ is the sign in the rule. There is one example given: *sa triñr ekādācāñ iha* (iii.2.11<sup>3</sup>: W. B. omit *sa*).

The approval of this rule is, of course, involved in that of its predecessor; and the usage of the recorded Tāittirīya text corresponds.

### स्रादिषु चैकपद उष्मपरः ॥४॥

4. *Anusvāra* is also inserted in the case of *sra* etc., in a single word, before a spirant.

“Also” (*ca*) in the rule, we are told, brings down the implication of the above specified increment. The *srādayas*, ‘*sra* etc.’ are the whole detail, given in the next chapter, of the occurrence of *anusvāra* in the Tāittirīya-Sanhita otherwise than as the result of the rules of combination, implied in rules 1–3 of this chapter. The precept, then, is introductory to the detail referred to, and also lays down some general limitations affecting it. The commentator quotes a single case, *goñśā modā iive 'ti* (iii.2.9<sup>5</sup>: it falls under xvi.2); and then gives counter-examples, establishing the restrictions made: *tūśām triñi cu* (ii.5.8<sup>3</sup>) shows that the insertion is made only under the circumstances defined in chapter xvi.; *tam mū sañ sriñ varcasā* (i.4.45<sup>3</sup> et al.: only G. M. have *varcasā*) and *prastaram ā hi sīdu* (ii.6.12<sup>6</sup>: found in O. only) show that it is to

---

2. *ekeshām mate pūrvasūtrokteshu*<sup>1</sup> *sānunāsikyam*<sup>2</sup> *na*<sup>3</sup> *bhavati*.  
*uktāny evo 'dāharanāni*.

*idam 'eve 'shtām' na tu pūrvam.*

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *sthāneshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *nā 'nu-*. <sup>3</sup> W. G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. *eva sūtram ish-*.

3. *tata iti sarvanāmnā parāmṛṣṭāt<sup>1</sup> svarāt<sup>2</sup> paro 'nusvāra'*  
*'gamo bhavati. yathā<sup>4</sup>: sa----. parāmṛṣṭasvarasyā<sup>5</sup> 'nundsi-*  
*kam<sup>6</sup> gunām tuçabdo nivartayat<sup>7</sup> 'ti<sup>8</sup>: tasmād anunāsikapra-*  
*shedhapaksha<sup>9</sup> evā 'yam anus ḍrāgamāḥ syāt.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-shta*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-ra*. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. *-svār*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> O. *-shtāt svara*.  
<sup>6</sup> G. M. *-ka*. <sup>7</sup> O. *-vāray-*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. om. *iti*. <sup>9</sup> W. B. *-dhāt p-*; G. M. *-dhāt vak-*  
*hyamīpa*.

eight vowels (namely *a*, *ā*, *i*, *ī*, *u*, *ū*, *r*, *ṝ*) are by [some?] teachers declared nasal when they are not *pragṛhya*, and stand as finals before a pause. This is different, first, in including *r* and *ṝ* (which are not *samāñāksharāni* according to our treatise: compare i.2; but the difference amounts to nothing, as the vowels in question never occur *avasáne*, but only *avagrahe*); and secondly, in limiting the nasalization to finals, before a pause. But it is perfectly evident that our rule also applies to finals only, and, as we shall see, the commentator resorts to great violence to bring in the implication of "final" in rule 8, below. Again, the specification "in *samhitā* also," in rule 8, and the interpretation of *padam* in rule 7 as signifying *padakāle*, 'in *pada*-text,' sufficiently prove that the present precept does not apply in *samhitā*—that is, that *avasáne*, 'in pausd,' is implied here. And the absence of statement or *anuvṛtti* of these two essential implications is strong additional evidence that the rules are interpolated.

By most of the MSS., only one example is given, namely *kulāyinī vasumati* (iv.3.4<sup>1</sup>), which, if our understanding, as above explained, is correct, is to be read, in *pada*-text, *kulāyinīः* : *vasumatiः*. O. adds *aminanta evādiḥ* (iii.1.11<sup>5</sup>), one of the cases of suspended combination falling under x.18, and (by R. Pr. ii.31,32) in the Rig-Veda requiring nasalization of the uncombined final: its citation seems to indicate that O. would not limit the operation of the rule to the *pada*-text. To show that the nasalization does not take place in uncombinable vowels, or *pragrahās*, are quoted, in *pada*-form, *amī iti* (iii.3.7<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *tanū iti* (ii.2.7<sup>5</sup>: omitted in O.). To illustrate the limitation to simple vowels, we find in most MSS. so *evāiśhāi tasya* (ii.2.9<sup>7</sup>); but O. gives instead *agnaye nikavate* (i.8.4<sup>1</sup> et al.), *vishṇav e' hī' dam* (ii.4.12<sup>3</sup>), and *vāyav ishtaye* (ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>).

The commentator, as he has done repeatedly before (under i.49, ii.7, v.2), notices the apposition in the rule of *apragrahādā* and *samāñāksharāni*, two words of different gender. He signifies, further, under the next rule, that both that and this are unapproved.

पदं च प्रुतः शाङ्कायनकाण्डमायनयोः ॥७॥

7. As is also, according to Cāṅkhāyana and Kāñḍamāyana, a protracted *pada*.

By *pada* is here signified, according to the commentator, a word

6. <sup>1</sup> *yāni samāñāksharāny apragrahasamāñjñāni tāny ēkeshādm mate bhavanty anunāsikāni*. <sup>4</sup> *kul-*..... *apragrahā iti kim: amī iti: tanū iti*. <sup>5</sup> *samāñāksharāñi 'ti kim: so----- pragrahāksharaçabdayor niyatālinigatayā' paraspārānvuyo ghañate na pragrahā apragrahādā*.

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *ekeshām acāryānām mate*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> O. *-kagunāni patashante*. <sup>4</sup> O. ins. *am-----*. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> O. *agn-----: vish-----: vāy-----*. <sup>7</sup> W. *niyamāt*.

the rule, but it would have to be answered in the negative (see the counter-examples below); and the text reads accordingly. The manuscripts of the commentary give as found “in another cākhā,” one example, read *brahmāsn* in W. B. (O. is wanting), and *yadghrā* in G. M.: I do not quite know what to make of this, as there seems to be no call for quoting from another text examples of what is capable of being fully illustrated from the received Veda of the school; *brahmāsn* is found at i.8.16<sup>1</sup> twice,<sup>2</sup> twice, but would be a counter-example to this rule, its *a* not being final; it is, in fact, of the same character with the first of the counter-examples given. These are *satyārdjāsn* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>), *agnās ity āha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>: W. has dropped out *agnās*), and *vicityāh somās na vicityās iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>: O. has only this).

Finally, the commentator remarks that Cāñkhāyana and Kāndamāyana also accept this principle. He may well say this, for the natural interpretation of the rule is to make it represent simply the view of those authorities; and the action of the comment, in cutting it loose from its predecessors, and declaring it alone to express the approved doctrine of the treatise, is in a high degree forced and arbitrary. It was noticed under i.58 what an unjustifiable act of violent interpretation was there committed, by way of preparation for this one. The implication of “final” is not needed in rule 8 any more than in rules 6 and 7, and is clearly enough made in them all; whence it comes, it would be the business of those who put the passage in to tell, if they could.

The Ath. Prāt. gives (at i.105) an enumeration of the protracted vowels occurring in the text to which it relates. This our treatise omits to do, and it may be well to repair the omission in this place. A final *a* is protracted to *ānās* at i.8.16<sup>2</sup> twice: ii.6.7<sup>3</sup>: vii.4.20: —*ah* to *āsh* at i.4.27: v.5.1<sup>3</sup>; and to *ās* (the *h* being lost) at i.5.9<sup>6</sup>: v.5.1<sup>3</sup>,<sup>2</sup> twice: vi.1.9<sup>1</sup> twice; 3.8<sup>1</sup>; 4.3<sup>4</sup>; 6.2<sup>3</sup>: —*an* to *āsn* at i.8.16<sup>1</sup> twice, 16<sup>2</sup> thrice: ii.6.5<sup>6</sup>: —*am* to *āsm* at vi.1.4<sup>5</sup>; 5.9<sup>1</sup>: vii.1.7<sup>4</sup>; 5.7<sup>1</sup> twice: —*i* to *īs* at i.7.2<sup>1</sup><sup>4</sup>: ii.4.12<sup>6</sup>: vi.5.9<sup>1</sup>: vii.1.6<sup>1</sup>,<sup>7</sup><sup>4</sup>: —*ih* to *īsh* or *īsr* at i.5.9<sup>6</sup>: vi.3.10<sup>1</sup>: —*in* to *īsn* at vii.4.20 twice: —*uh* to *īsr* at vi.3.8<sup>1</sup>: —*e* to *āsi* at i.4.27: vi.1.4<sup>5</sup>; and

8. sāmnidhyād anunāsikaplutāu<sup>1</sup> gṛhyete: tuçabdāḥ prakṛtācāryamatānivartakah<sup>2</sup>: ata<sup>3</sup> eva<sup>4</sup> saṁhitāyām asaṁhitāyām<sup>5</sup> cā 'kārah padāntāḥ pluto 'nunāsiko bhavati: yady apy akāra iti<sup>6</sup> sāmānyeno 'ktāḥ: tathā 'py anvādego 'ntyasya (i.58) iti vacanād apiçabdo 'nunāsikadharmatayā nimittinam padāntam evā 'kāram anvādiçati. yathā<sup>7</sup>: suçl----: upa----: 'yago----: brahmāsn<sup>8</sup> ity anyasyām<sup>10</sup> cākhāyām<sup>9</sup>. apiçabdhāḥ kimarthah: '1saty----: agn----:<sup>11</sup> vicityāh---- cāñkhāyanakāndamāyanayor apy ayām vidhir<sup>12</sup> akāre plute sammatāh<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -plute. <sup>2</sup> O. pūrvācāry-. <sup>3</sup> W. eta; M. tata. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. om. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> B. O. om. <sup>8</sup> O. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. yadghrā. <sup>10</sup> G. M. asya. <sup>11</sup> O. om. <sup>12</sup> G. M. -raplulas sammatām.

to his treatment of it, and conjecture that, if he could only have told us what it meant, we might have found in it something to approve. We are tempted to seek in it some statement as to the accent of the protracted syllable, or *pada*; and, if it were allowed to amend *pūrveshām* to *ekeshām*, we might translate, ‘some hold that the whole word in which protraction occurs is to be uttered in the same tone’—only then, to be sure, we should look for a statement of the usage actually followed in the text.

## CHAPTER XVI.

CONTENTS: 1–31, detail of the cases of occurrence, in the *Sanhita*, of *s* in the interior of a word, before a spirant.

### अथ सकारपरा: ॥१॥

1. Now for cases in which *s* follows.

A simple heading, of force through a considerable part of the chapter (i. e. through rule 13). The essential item of the precept laid down was given above, in xv.4, which directed that in all the cases to be specified in this chapter is to be assumed the presence of *anusvāra* following a vowel and followed by a spirant. Words in which that spirant is *s* form by far the most numerous class, and until rule 14 they alone are treated.

The Rik Pr. is the only one of the other treatises which offers anything at all analogous with this enumeration; it (at xiii.7–10) gives rules for the occurrence of *anusvāra* after long vowels only.

### सशोऽह्याश पदाद्यः स्वरपरे ॥२॥

2. *Sra*, *ço*, *ha*, *pā*, and *ça*, at the beginning of a *pada*, take *anusvāra* before a *s* that is followed by a vowel.

The commentator cites examples, as follows. For *sra*, *visrañsa-yed amehend* ‘*dhvaryuh*’ (vi.2.9<sup>4</sup>, 10<sup>7</sup>: G. M. O. have only the first word); we have other cases at ii.5.7<sup>2</sup>: v.1.6<sup>1</sup>: vii.3.10<sup>3</sup>, all from the same root, *sras*. For *ço*, *coñsa moda* *ive* ‘*ti*’ (iii.2.9<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit the last word, O. the last two); I have noted no other case: as counter-example, to show that only *o* after *ç* takes the increment, is given *äçasñā* *śdumanasam* (i.1.10<sup>1</sup>: O. alone has the latter

1. *athe* ‘*ty ayam adhikārah*: *itā* *uttare grahanavīcēshāh*<sup>1</sup> *sakāraparāh*<sup>2</sup> *ity etad adhikṛtam* *veditavyam*. *sakārah paro* ‘*yebhyas te sakāraparāh*<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> B. -*shah*. <sup>2</sup> B. -*para*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ* (and -*parah* in the rule).

## विकृते ऽपि ॥३॥

3. Even when the vowel is altered.

That is to say, even when the vowel that is by the last rule required to follow the *s* has undergone euphonic alteration, so as to become a consonant. A single example is cited, *apahañsy agne* (iv.7.13<sup>1</sup>; p. *apa-hañsi*); if the text contains any others, they have escaped my notice.

## रापूर्वश्च ॥४॥

4. As also, when they are preceded by *ra*.

This rule is made for the purpose of establishing a single additional case under the general rule given above (xvi.2), namely, the word *nārāgañśibhyah* (vii.5.11<sup>2</sup>); the case being one, as the comment points out, where the *ca* is not at the beginning of a *pada*. The *ca*, ‘also,’ brings down only *ca*; and we are assured that this is the reason why *ca* was mentioned last in rule 2, even at the cost of a violation of the natural order of the vowels. Of this point we need not make much, since the rule contains other and unexplained violations of alphabetic order.

## शस्त्रानन्तोदाते ॥५॥

5. Also in *cañstā*, except when it is accented on the final syllable.

Here is another single case, falling under rule 2 by the suspension of one of the restrictions laid down in that rule—namely, that the *s* be followed by a vowel. The passage is *utā cañstā sūviprah* (iv.6.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *sūviprah*). The restriction as to accent

---

3. *apicabdaḥ srarānvādeçakah*<sup>1</sup>: *sakārāt pare tasmint svare vikṛtam āpanne 'pi vyañjanatām upagate 'pi syād*<sup>2</sup> *anuśvāravidihiḥ*<sup>3</sup>. *yathā*: *ap-*-----

<sup>1</sup> B. *sakārān-*. <sup>2</sup> W. and O.(?) *svārad*. <sup>3</sup> lacuna in O., from (*anusvāra-*) *vidhiḥ* to *svara* under the next rule.

4. *'caçabdaḥ srādishu*<sup>1</sup> *çakāram anvādicati*<sup>2</sup>: *etadartham eva svaravyatyaye*<sup>3</sup> 'pi *çakāragrahanām* *tatrā* 'nte *kṛtam*. *rā*: *ity evampūrvah çakārah sakāraparo* 'nuśvārāgamam *bhajate*. *yathā*: *nār-*----- *apadādyartho*<sup>4</sup> 'yam *ārambhah*.

<sup>1</sup> W. *çabdasyāddishu*; B. *sacacabdādīshu*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. ins. *cakārah*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *vyaktyaye*; O. begins again with *vyatyaye*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. *apadartha*.

5. *cañstā*: *ity etasmin' grahanे 'nantodātte*<sup>2</sup> *sakārapare bhavaty*<sup>3</sup> *anuśvārāgamah*. *utā*----- *anantodāttā*<sup>4</sup> *iti kim*: *açv-*----- *sraçoḥa* (xvi.2) *iti prāptāu satyām*<sup>5</sup> *sokārasya*<sup>6</sup> *svaraparativā-*

## मा पदादिरनुदातः ॥ ८ ॥

8. *Mā* takes *anusvāra* when beginning a *pada* and unaccented.

All the implications of rule 2 are here cut off (as is distinctly enough intimated by the express repetition of one of them, *padādi*), and hence it is to be understood that the increment takes place before a *s* whether this be or be not followed by a vowel. The examples are *áhar mānséna* (v.7.20) and *māñspácaanydh* (iv.6.9<sup>1</sup>). The restriction to the beginning of a *pada* is established by quoting *sūlikamadhyamásah* (iv.6.7<sup>4</sup>); that as to the accent, by *māsaṁ dikshitāḥ syāt* (v.6.7<sup>3</sup>: only O. has *syāt*).

So far as I have discovered, this rule applies only to forms and combinations of *mānsa*, which are not infrequent in the Sanhitā. The four following rules give it certain extensions and limitations.

## पुमीपूर्वश्च नित्यम् ॥ ९ ॥

9. As also when preceded by *pu* or *mī*, under all circumstances.

The closing specification of the rule amounts to a removal of the restriction as to accent, imposed in rule 8—that as to initial position being virtually removed by the prescribed prefixion of *pu* or *mī*. The examples quoted are *ut pumānsaṁ haranti* (vi.5.10<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *haranti*, and B. runs the two citations together, having dropped out a part of each) and *mimānsante kārye* (vi.2.6<sup>4</sup>). We have *pumānsam* again at iv.6.6<sup>5</sup>, and other forms of *mimānsa* at vi.2.6<sup>4</sup> and vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>: I have noted no other words as falling under the rule.

## सकायपरश्च ॥ १० ॥

10. And when followed by *sakāya*.

The *ca*, ‘and,’ we are told, here brings down *mā*; and G. M. add that the intent of the rule is to establish an exception under

8. *mā*: *ity evaṁ<sup>1</sup> varṇāḥ padādir anudāttāḥ sakāruparo ‘nu-*  
*svārāgamam bhajate. atra niyamābhāvāt sakārusya svarapara-*  
*tvābhāve ‘pi nimittatvam bhavuty eva. ‘yuthā’: ahar----: māns-*  
*---- padādir iti kim: sili----. anudātta iti kim: māsaṁ*  
*----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. *ayam*. <sup>2</sup> O. *om*.

9. *caçabdo me ‘ti jñāpayati: pu: mē: ity evampūrvo me ‘ti<sup>1</sup>*  
*varṇāḥ sakāraparo nityam anusvārāgamam bhajate. ut----:*  
*mīm----- anudāttatvanivartako<sup>2</sup> nityaçabdāḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. ins. *ayam*. <sup>2</sup> O. *-niyamavyāvar-*

with *mási*. This interpretation is, of course, forced and false: *mási* is included with the rest here because it is an example of the same class with them; and the makers of the treatise, when they put it in, either overlooked or neglected the fact that it falls technically under rule 14, and so also under rule 17, establishing exceptions to 14. We have also *mási-mási*, more than once, at vii.5.1<sup>6</sup>.

हि पु निगानिधा हृश्मिने ऽत असयदाता असीत्कनीयाज्याया-  
द्राधीयारधीयाश्रेयाङ्गसीयावसीयाभूयाऽसो निवाज्ञप्तिवा-  
निगिवाजीगिवातस्थिवादाश्वादीदिवापपिवापीपिवावि-  
द्वाविविशिवाशुश्रुवासस्त्वा ॥ १३ ॥

13. The following words have *anusvāra* before *s*: *hi*, *pu*, *jigā*, *jighā*, *chañsine*, *atañsayat*, *ātañśit*, *kan̄yā*, *jyāyā*, *drāghīyā*, *ra-  
ghīyā*, *creyā*, *hrasīyā*, *vasīyā*, *bhūyāñsaḥ*, *jakshīvā*, *jaghnīvā*, *ji-  
givā*, *jīgivā*, *tasthīvā*, *dāçvā*, *dīdivā*, *papīvā*, *pīpīvā*, *vidvā*, *vivi-  
cīvā*, *cuçruvā*, *sasṛvā*.

The commentator's examples are as follows: *hiñśih parame  
vyoman* (iv.2.10<sup>1-2,3</sup>: O. omits *vyoman*, and G. M. substitute *mā  
hiñśis tanuvā*, iv.2.3<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *cinute 'hiñśayāi* (v.2.8<sup>4</sup>: O. omits  
*cinute*); respecting this first specification, see further below;—  
*tena puñsvatih* (ii.5.8<sup>5</sup>) and *puñsuh putrān* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>): I have only  
noted farther two cases of *puñsah*, at ii.6.5<sup>5</sup> and vi.5.8<sup>2</sup>;—*lokam  
ajigāñsan* (v.5.5<sup>4</sup>: vi.5.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *lokam*): elsewhere only at iii.  
2.2<sup>3</sup>;—*tvashtāram ajighāñsan* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>): the text presents four-  
teen other cases of *jighāñs*;—*brahmañdchañsine* (i.8.18): the  
only case: a counter-example (but O. omits all the counter-ex-  
amples), *pra yuchasy ubhe ni pāsi* (i.4.22), shows the necessity  
of including in the citation the *ne* of *chañsine*;—*gabhe muñtīm  
atañsayat* (vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>), with a counter-example, *atasām na cuskam*  
(i.2.14<sup>2</sup>), to explain the citation of the whole word *atañsayat*;—  
*anuātañśit tvayi*, (iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>: O. omits *tvayi*), with *anu vrātāsas tava*  
(iv.6.7<sup>8</sup>), to prove the need of the final *it*;—*kanīyāñso devāḥ*  
(v.8.11<sup>1</sup>): the text offers half-a-dozen cases of this comparative,  
and about the same number of the next;—*jyāyāñso bhrāturaḥ*

12. *'cakāro nishedhākarshakah<sup>1</sup>:* *mási* ..... *ity eteshu graha-*  
*neshu na syād anusvārāgamāḥ*. *eshām api mā padādir* (xvi.8)  
*iti prāptih*. *kecid atra prath-* ..... *ity udāharanti<sup>2</sup>:* *tad asādhu:*  
*na pade dvisvare nityam<sup>3</sup>* (xvi.17) *ity anendā 'va nishedha-*  
*siddheḥ*: *tasmād anyaçākhyām<sup>4</sup> bāhusvaram apuram<sup>5</sup> udāhara-*  
*nam avadhārapīyam*. *daçsu* ..... *shān* ..... *másām* .....

<sup>1</sup>O. om. <sup>2</sup>W. -*ramām*. <sup>3</sup>W. O. *n*; G. M. om. <sup>4</sup>W. -*dham siddhah*; B. -*dhaḥ*  
*siddhah*. <sup>5</sup>G. M. *anyasyām* cf. <sup>6</sup>B. G. M. *param*; O. om.

exposition given under rule 2 (see note on that rule) of the reason why *hi* was not there included: *hi* here is meant not as initial only, but wherever found in a word. Since, however, it is only in this one word that *hiñś-* occurs otherwise than as initial, it would seem better to have disposed of the single case as of those which form the subject of rules 6 and 10, and to put *hi* into 2, where it would look much more at home than here at the head of a troop of perfect participles and comparatives. And why *pu* was not put into rule 2 without any ceremony, I cannot see at all; unless I have overlooked some case or cases of its occurrence, *puñś* is invariably initial.

The commentator raises the question why rule xv.4 does not require us to insert an *anusvāra* before the *s* of *dāgvā*, *vivicivā*, and *cucruvā*, since these too are *srādayah*; and he makes answer that it is because the restriction conveyed in xvi.1 is still in force. But in that case, he goes on to say, is there not a nasal increment before the *s* of *hrasīyā*, *vasīyā*, *tasthīvā*, and *sasīvā*? The answer to this objection is twofold. First, the competency of the citation is pleaded—that is to say, the words being read in the rule itself without nasal, that is to be understood as their authoritative form (compare under rule 19, where this plea leads to a further discussion). Secondly, the words in question being found associated with *atāñśit*, *kaniyā*, *jyāyā*, and so on, all of which show the *anusvāra* to follow a long vowel, we are to infer that in the others also it does not follow a short vowel. The first of these answers is not such as is wont to be pleaded in this treatise, and the second is evidently very weak: I should almost prefer to assume that the difficulty was not remarked by the authors of the treatise, and that the commentators who have discovered it have been forced to make the best excuse they could for it.

A more serious objection to the rule, it seems to me, is that it mixes together cases of two different classes—those in which (*chañśine* etc.) the nasal appears in the word itself as cited, and those in which it is to be added before a following *s*. Of this, however, the comment takes no notice.

---

*na syāt. atha sakāraparād<sup>13</sup> (xvi.1) ity uśhnavicēshasya<sup>14</sup> sa-kārasyā 'nuvr̥ttir<sup>15</sup> iti vadāmah. tarhi hrasīyāvāsiyātasthīvāsa-sr̥ve 'ty atra<sup>16</sup> sakārapara evā "gamah<sup>17</sup> kim na syāt. uccāra-na-sāmarthyād eve 'ty prathamah<sup>18</sup> pariḥārah. atha vā: atāñśitka-nīyājyāye 'tyādīshu sarvatra dīrghānantaram evā 'nusvārasthā-nam<sup>19</sup> iti sāhacaryād<sup>20</sup> atrā 'pi na syād anusvārasya hrasvānam-taram<sup>20</sup> sthānam ity<sup>21</sup> aparah pariḥārah.*

<sup>13</sup> B. om. <sup>2</sup> O. -māni. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *syāt*; O. *bhajate*. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *ins. apy akārādi* (1.52) *prāptih.* <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> O. om. <sup>8</sup> O. om. <sup>9</sup> O. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *ins. nanu.* <sup>12</sup> O. *vidvāvivicēshāsuçrushāsasr̥ve.* <sup>13</sup> W. om. *parā;* G. M. -*para.* <sup>14</sup> G. M. -*shānasya.* <sup>15</sup> G. M. O. -*tier.* <sup>16</sup> W. *makārasyā "gamah;* O. ... *evā 'nusvārāg..* <sup>17</sup> G. M. -*ma.* <sup>18</sup> W. -*svārah.* <sup>19</sup> G. M. O. *tatsāh.* <sup>20</sup> W. G. M. *hrasvānt.* <sup>21</sup> W. *iti 'ty.*

## अनाकारो द्विस्वरं सांकृत्यस्य ॥ १६ ॥

16. According to Sāmkṛtya, the vowel, except *a*, is short.

That is to say, the two vowels *i* and *u*, to which alone reference has been made above, become short in the cases here referred to: for example, in *haviñshi bhavanti* (v.5.1<sup>7</sup> et al.: O. omits *bhavanti*) and *samishṭayajñashi juhoti* (vi.6.2<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit *juhoti*), where Sāmkṛtya would read *haviñshi* and *yajñashi*, while in *vayāñsi* (v. 7.23 et al.: O. omits) he would admit the long vowel.

A curious case of dissent upon a point in grammar which we have not been accustomed to regard as open to any difference of opinion. The rule is, naturally enough, pronounced unapproved.

G. M. add *ca* to the rule, after *sāmkṛtyasya*.

## न पदे द्विस्वरे नित्यम् ॥ १७ ॥

17. Not, under any circumstances, in a dissyllabic word.

This is a rule prescribing exceptions under rule 14; the addition *nityam*, ‘under any circumstances,’ confirms its application to words ending in *si* or *shi* after *a*, *i*, or *u* which would otherwise fall under any other rule prescribing the increment.

Examples under rule 14 alone are first quoted, namely *stuto yāsi vacāñ anu* (i.8.5<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. end with *yāsi*) and *yāsi dūtāḥ* (iii.5.5<sup>2</sup>: G. M. have dropped out *yāsi*). Then, as a case also under rule 2, we have *vidhataḥ pāsi nu tmanā* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>); and, as one under rule 8, *prathame māsi prshthāni* (vii.5.3<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), which has been already made the subject of discussion under rule 12, above. The force of the *nityam* does not go so far as to prohibit an *anusvāra* in every dissyllabic word before *si*, what-

16. ākārād anyo 'nākārah: īkāra īkāraç ce 'ty arthaḥ: taylor  
eva prakṛtatvāt. sāmkṛtyasya mata īkāra īkāraç ca hrasvam  
āpadyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: hav----: sam----. "anākāra iti kim:  
vayāñsi.<sup>2</sup>

ne 'dam sūtram iṣṭan.

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> O. om.

17. dvīsvare<sup>1</sup> pade vartamānā<sup>2</sup> ākārekārokārāh<sup>3</sup> padāntasishiparā<sup>4</sup> nā<sup>5</sup> nusvārāgamac<sup>6</sup> bhajante. yathā<sup>7</sup>: stuto----: "yāsi----. nityaçabdah prāptyantarapratishedhārthaḥ: vidhataḥ----:<sup>8</sup> "srago ha<sup>10</sup> (xvi.2) iti prāptih: prathame----: mā padādir<sup>11</sup> (xvi.8) iti prāptih. dvāu svarāu yasmin<sup>12</sup> vidyete tad dvīsvaram: tasmin.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> O. dvīvasv-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -na. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ākārah īkārah; O. ākāra īkārah. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -ntas sīhi-pāro; O. -ntā si-. <sup>5</sup> B. om.; G. M. nityan nā. <sup>6</sup> B. ins. na; O. ins. nityum. <sup>7</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>8</sup> W. om. <sup>9</sup> B. om. <sup>10</sup> O. -hapāça padādaya. <sup>11</sup> O. -dir ijās. <sup>12</sup> G. M. ins. pade.

with *ātī*); *purudaiñsuñ sanim* (iv.2.4<sup>3</sup>); *vṛshaduñcas te dhātuñ* (v.5.12): there is another case at v.5.21; *paçūn dañçukdī syur yad vishācīnam* (v.2.9<sup>6</sup>: O. omits the first word, and it alone has the last two); and *dañshtrābhyām malimlān* (iv.1.10<sup>2</sup>): there is another case at v.7.11. To the objection that the citation in the rule of *dañsa* simply might have saved the rehearsal of whole words [in a part of the cases given], the commentator replies by quoting *kurvato me mo 'pa dusat* (i.6.3<sup>3</sup> et al.) as an example of cases which need to be excluded. The addition of *paraḥ*, 'in the latter place,' is because *vṛshadañçah* contains two places at which, by xv.4, the *anusvāra* would otherwise require to be inserted.

This last point, however, does not pass (except in O.) without farther question and discussion. The objection is raised that the mere citation of *vṛshadañca* without *anusvāra* before the former sibilant is enough to settle its reading, according to the same principle that was appealed to under rule 13, for *hrasiyā*, *vasiyā*, and so on. This is undeniable; and the only real answer to be made is that there was no harm in adding *para* here, to make the matter sure, while it could not have been employed in rule 13 without occasioning a great deal of additional trouble. The commentator, however, prefers to have recourse to a plea of exceptionally puerile character. In xv.4 (the rule here in force), he says, the spirants in general are implied, but in xvi.1 (in force at rule 13) a special spirant, *s*; and it is an acknowledged principle that, as between a generality and a specification, the specification is the more powerful. That being the case, the putting down of that

*vuto----ityādāu mā bhūd iti. 'para iti kim: vṛshadañça ity atru<sup>8</sup> sthānadvoye 'pi srādishu cāi 'kupadu* (xv.4) *iti prāptāu satyām pūrvatru<sup>9</sup> mā bhūd iti. nunu grahanasāmurthyād evā 'nusvārah<sup>10</sup> pūrvatra na bhūvati: yathā hrasiyāvusiyā* (xvi. 13) *ityādāu grahanasāmurthyād<sup>11</sup> upapāditam. nāi 'sha doshuḥ: srādishu cāi 'kapada* (xv.4) *ity atro "shmusāmānyam uktum: atha sakāraparā* (xvi.1) *ity utra tu tadviçesha uktah: sāmānyaviçeshayor viçesho balavān iti nyāyah: tathā sati <sup>12</sup>balavud-bādhānam<sup>13</sup> eva bhūshānam <sup>14</sup>na tu <sup>14</sup> durbalubādhūnam<sup>15</sup> iti<sup>12</sup> tatrāi 'va grahanasāmarthyān<sup>16</sup> samarthanāyam: na tv atra<sup>17</sup> durbalasthāne: tathā 'pi<sup>18</sup>: <sup>19</sup> adhikuh<sup>20</sup> purusho virodhinam<sup>21</sup> udhikam eva bādhate bhūshānatvāt: na tu kadācid alpabalam<sup>22</sup>: iti<sup>23</sup> paraçabduprayoga<sup>24</sup> upapadyate.<sup>7</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> O. prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -di. <sup>3</sup> G. M. syāt. <sup>4</sup> in W. only. <sup>5</sup> O. ins. *ity utrā 'py akārādi* (i.5.2) *iti vacanād anusvārā gamah syāt: tan mā bhūd iti.* <sup>6</sup> G. M. -ñhanena. <sup>7</sup> O. om. <sup>8</sup> W. ava. <sup>9</sup> W. -rva. <sup>10</sup> B. -rāgamañ. <sup>11</sup> W. sāmarthyāgrahanām. <sup>12</sup> W. balavatiyam eva bhūshānam: vādhānam eva bhūshānam na tu durbalam iti bādhana. <sup>13</sup> G. M. -vatsādīh-; B. -dham. <sup>14</sup> G. M. om. <sup>15</sup> G. M. -lasidhānam na sidhv. <sup>16</sup> W. -nam eva sāmarthyān; B. -rhya. <sup>17</sup> B. arthu. <sup>18</sup> G. M. hi. <sup>19</sup> G. M. ins. loke. <sup>20</sup> W. adh-; G. M. -ka. <sup>21</sup> W. -dhanam. <sup>22</sup> W. B. apy alpam. <sup>23</sup> B. iti 'ti. <sup>24</sup> W. B. atra çadd-

## अक्रङ्स्तक्रङ्स्यतेरङ्स्यतेवङ्शते ॥ २२ ॥

22. Also in *akrañsta*, *krañsyate*, *rañsyate*, and *bhrañçate*.

The passages are *dyām vājy a'krañsta* (vii.5.19<sup>1</sup>), *utkrañsyate svāhā* (vii.1.19<sup>2</sup>), *uparañsyate svāhā* (vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>: B. O. omit), and *nd' smiād rāshtrum bhrañçate* (v.7.4<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the first two words); *bhrañçate* occurs also at i.6.11<sup>1</sup> twice.

G. M. read *utkrañsyate* for *krañsyate* in the rule.

## रङ्ख्यै च ॥ २३ ॥

23. And also in *rañhyāi*.

The only passage is *pūshno rañhyāi* (i.3.10<sup>2</sup>). The significance of the *ca*, 'and,' which is here out of its proper place, will be given, we are told, under the next rule.

## ऐकार उख्यस्य नितातः ॥ २४ ॥

24. The *āi*, according to Ukhya, is excessive.

That is to say, according to the commentator, the *āi* of the word *rañhyāi*, here brought forward by the *ca*, 'and,' which is read in the preceding rule. *Nitāta*, 'excessive,' is explained as signifying 'uttered with more violent effort.' The whole business is a very queer one—Ukhya's opinion itself, its introduction here at a place where it is entirely impertinent, and the bit of interpretation whereby it is worked into the connection.

## विरिति संख्यासु ॥ २५ ॥

25. Also in *vi*, *ri*, and *tri*, in numerals, except in *su*.

22. <sup>1</sup>*akrañste 'tyādishu syād anusvārāgamaḥ*. *dyām*.....  
*utkr-*.....<sup>2</sup> *upā-*.....<sup>2</sup> *nā-*.....

<sup>(1)</sup> O. substitutes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule (except the last), and *eteshu grahaṇeshu anusvārāgamo bhavati*. <sup>(2)</sup> B. O. om.

23. *rañhyā ity asmin grahaṇe syād anusvārāgamaḥ*. *pūshno*.....  
*cakārasya 'vyatihārenī 'nvaya' uttarasūtre prayojanam*  
*ucyate*.

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. *vyavahārād anveyād*.

24. *rañhyā ity usmin<sup>1</sup> grahaṇe pūrvasūtrasthacakārasamar-*  
*pita<sup>2</sup> āikāro nitānto bharatī 'ty<sup>3</sup> ukhyasya<sup>4</sup> mate<sup>5</sup>. nitāntas tīvra-*  
*taraprayutna ity arthah.*

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(2)</sup> B. -*trasya cak-*; O. -*treprayosthacak-*; G. M. -*pite*. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. om.  
*iti*. <sup>(4)</sup> W. *ukhya*; O. *ukhyasyā* "cīryasya". <sup>(5)</sup> O. -*tām*.

26. Also in *ciñcumārah*, *ciñshat*, *sañcīrā*, *sañsrā*, *sañṣṭhīa*, *sañskṛtya*, *sañskṛta*, *sañcīta*, *sañcītā*, *kiñcila*, and *kiñcīlā*.

The passages, as quoted, are *sindhoh ciñcumdro himavataḥ* (v. 5.11: only O. has the last word); *kim tata uc chiñhati 'ti yad dhiranyeshtakdī* (v. 5.5<sup>2</sup>: only O. has the last two words, and it omits the first two); *ubhayataḥsañcīvāyi kuryād avadāyā 'bhi* (ii. 6.8<sup>4</sup>: only O. has the last two words, and it leaves off *ubhayataḥ*); *suñsrāvabhāgā stha* (i. 1.13<sup>2</sup>); *sañṣṭhājīt eomapdī* (iv. 6.4<sup>1</sup>: W. B. put this after the next following example; see farther on); *ca-rīrum eva sañskṛtyā 'bhyārohati* (v. 6.6<sup>3-4</sup>: O. omits the first two words; and all but O. omit the last one, thus making a citation which is also found again in v. 6.6<sup>4</sup>); *tan naḥ sañskṛtam* (i. 4.43<sup>2</sup>); *brahmaśañcīto hy esha gṛtāhavanāḥ* (ii. 5.9<sup>2</sup>: only O. has the last word); *garavye brahmaśañcītā* (iv. 6.4<sup>4</sup>); *kiñcīla vanya yā ta iṣhūḥ* (v. 5.9<sup>1</sup>: all but G. M. end with *te*); and *kiñcīlaç caturtho vanyāḥ* (v. 5.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. alone have *vanyāḥ*) and *kiñcīlāya ca kshayaṇḍyā ca* (iv. 5.9<sup>1</sup>: O. ends with the first *ca*). The commentary prefaces the last two passages with the remark that the second citation of *kiñcīla* is that of a part of a word, including a variety of cases. But this, in the first place, would imply that the reading of the rule at the end was *kiñcīlakiñcīla*, which is the case only in T.; and, in the second place, even were that the reading, the explanation would be a bad one, and the repeated *kiñcīla* should be defined as a theme ending in *a*, and so including the declensional forms of that theme, by i.22: in fact, it was expressly cited under that rule, as an example of its application. If *kiñcīlā* is the true reading (as I presume to be the case), then we must suppose that the makers of the rule intended both words as *paddikadeça*'s, the one involving the first two examples quoted, the other the third, and the case being quite parallel with that of *sañcīta* and *sañcītā*, just preceding: but the comment has discovered a difficulty, namely, that *kiñcīla* is actually a *pada* in the text (v. 5.9<sup>1</sup>), and therefore cannot be quoted without ceremony as a *paddikadeça* (see under rule 29, where this is more distinctly brought out); and hence its efforts to amend the reading and interpretation—efforts in which it is too intent upon the end to be gained to be mindful of consistency in the means employed. In short, here as in many other places, the Prātiçākhya is less minutely accurate in its modes of statement than the commentator would fain have it, and he undertakes to make it what it should be by forced interpretation.

26. <sup>1</sup> *ciñcumāra ityāddigrahañeshu<sup>2</sup> syād anusvārāgamah. ya-thāḥ: sindhoh...: kim...: ubhay...: sañsr...: sañṣṭhī...: garī...: tan...: brahm...: <sup>4</sup> gar...: kiñcīlā...: parakiñcīlagrahanam<sup>5</sup> padākadeçatayā bahupādānār-tham: kiñcīlaç...: kiñcīlāya...: nanu' sañṣṭhī 'ty atra shakāraparo 'nusvārāgamah kim na syāt. māi 'vam: atra sūtre sarvatra' padādivarṇānantaram<sup>6</sup> evā 'nusvāradarçanāt: tatsāha-*

noun *siñha*, and of forms from the roots *tr̥ñh* and *d̥r̥ñh*, which alone come under the action of the rule, there are other cases in the Sanhitā. Counter-examples are given (excepting in O.): to show that no other syllables take the increment before *h*, *sapatnasāhī sr̥ghā* (i.2.12<sup>2</sup>: but G. M. substitute *saputnasāhiñ sam mārjmi*, i.1.10<sup>1</sup>) and *anatidāhāyo 'vāca* (v.2.10<sup>3</sup>); that *r* takes the increment only when preceded by *t* or *d*, *gr̥hāñdām usamartyāi* (iii.3.8<sup>2</sup>); that the increment is taken only before *h*, *sishāsanātīh* (vii.5.2<sup>1</sup>: G. M. read *sishāsaḥ*, but doubtless by a blunder only), *tr̥shvīm anu* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>), and *naktam d̥r̥ge dēpyate* (v.6.4<sup>4</sup>).

## मञ्जिष्ठस्य च ॥२८॥

28. As also, in *mañhishthasya*.

That is to say, before the *h*, which is brought down from the preceding rule by *ca*, expressly in order to exclude the assumption of *anusvāra* before the *sh* and *s* in the same word. The passage is *mañhishthasya prabhṛtasya* (iv.2.3<sup>4</sup>), and there is no other.

आदिरङ्गतिरङ्ग्होङ्ग्होरङ्ग्होमुगत्यङ्ग्हात्रङ्ग्हसोङ्ग्ह-  
साङ्गशमङ्ग्शुभिरङ्ग्शमुवाङ्ग्शुअङ्ग्शवोङ्ग्शुरङ्ग्शुमङ्ग्शु-  
नङ्ग्शुनाङ्ग्शोरङ्ग्शायोपाङ्ग्शश्चौ ॥२९॥

29. Also, after the first vowel, in *añhatiñ*, *añhah*, *añhoh*, *añhcmuc*, *atyañhāh*, *añhasañ*, *añhasā*, *añcam*, *añcubhiñ*, *añcabhuñ*, *añcu*, *añcū*, *añcavah*, *añcūh*, *añcum*, *añcūn*, *añcunā*, *añcoh*, *añcaya*, *upañcu*, and *añcāu*.

We have here a detailed list of complete *padas* (or, in one or two instances, more than a whole *pada*), in which *anusvāra* is found. The illustrative examples are as follows. For *añhatiñ*, *pari dneshaso añhatiñ* (ii.6.11<sup>2</sup>): the only case. For *añhah*, *añhomucam vṛshabham yajñiyāñdām* (i.6.12<sup>4</sup>; p. *añhah-mucam*: G. M. O. omit the last word); *añhah* is found four or five times in the Sanhitā as an independent word, and about fifteen times in the

---

*pārva iti kim: sap-----: anati----- rkārendāi 'vā<sup>5</sup> lam: kim*  
*takāradakārābhyām: gr̥h----- evampura iti kim: sish-----:*  
*tr̥shvīm-----: naktam----- hakārah paro yasmād 'asāu hakā-*  
*raparah.<sup>6</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -rañ ca. <sup>2</sup> O. asāu hekāraparāh. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. eva. <sup>6</sup> G. M. sa tāthoktaḥ.

28. *mañhishthasye 'ty asmin grahanē cakkākṛṣṭuhakāraparo*  
*'nusvārāgamo bhavati<sup>1</sup>. yathā<sup>2</sup>: mañh----- 'cakkāñh kimar-*  
*thāh: atrāi 'va grahanē sashakāraparo mā bhūd iti.<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. syāt. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> O. om.

same division, and in no other. For *añcundā*, *añcunā te añcuḥ* (i.2.6: G. M. O. end with *te*). For *añcoh*, *yo vā añcor ḥyatanaṁ veda* (vi.6.10<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last two words, and B. has lost the whole example, with most of the preceding one). For *añcāya*, *añcāya svāhā bhagdya* (i.8.13<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *bhagdya*). For *upañcu*, *upañcūsavano yad upañcūsavanam* (vi.4.4<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the first two words). The word *upañcu*, when not further compounded, is separated in *pada*-text into *upa-añcu*, and so most of its forms come under the various citations of the cases of *añcu* already illustrated (thus, it furnishes additional instances, not counted above, to *añcu*, *añcuḥ*, *añcum*, and *añcoh*, twenty in all); but in its compounds it makes, of course, a single *pada* of itself (thus, *upañcu-savāḥ*), and so has to be cited in the rule as such (we have other combinations, namely, with *pātra*, *yāja*, and *antaryāma*); and, moreover, we have one case, *upañcāu*, showing a form of *añcu* which does not appear independently, and so furnishing the final citation, for which the example is *tam upañcāu sam asthāpayan* (vi.4.6<sup>1</sup>): there is another in the same division.

The restriction *ādih*, ‘after the first vowel,’ is intended to guard against any one’s imagining that the *s* of *añhasaḥ* and so on is to be preceded by *anusvāra*.

What has thus been given represents the whole comment as found in O.; the other MSS. make two or three troublesome additions, to which it is necessary to return. The last of them regards the citation of *añcu* and its inflectional forms (namely, those that contain *añcu* as a part, or *añcubhiḥ*, *añcuḥ*, *añcum*, *añcundā*); and, if I understand it aright, it asserts that, if *añcu* alone were cited, the other forms would not be included, because *añcu* itself occurs as a *pada* (and would therefore have to be taken as such, and not as a part of a word, *paddikadeṣa*); and if it be proposed to cite it with each value, as was done with *kiñcīlu* (in rule 26: see note to that rule), there remains the difficulty that, as a phonetic complex only, it would involve such cases as *pañcum pañcupate te adya* (iii.1.4<sup>1</sup>: W. omits *pañcum*)—where, namely, we have the same elements in combination, only without the *anusvāra*. With regard to *añca*, a somewhat similar statement appears to be made: namely, that if *añca* simply were quoted, it would be understood as a *pada* (being such in *añca-bhuvā*), and hence *añcam* would

<sup>23</sup> *tvayā*...: <sup>24</sup> *bhuve* 'ti kim: *añce* 'ty etāvatā<sup>25</sup> *grahane* *tathāvidhapadasadbhāvāt* *añcam*<sup>26</sup> *ity atra na*<sup>27</sup> *syāt*:<sup>24</sup> *tenā*...: <sup>28</sup> *apy akārādi* (i.52) *iti vacanād anañcu*... *ity apy*<sup>29</sup> *uddharanam*:<sup>28</sup> *vṛshno*...: *prāṇā*...: <sup>30</sup> *añcūr*...: <sup>30</sup> *yam*...: <sup>31</sup> *añcūn*...: <sup>31</sup> *añcunā*...: *yo*...: *añcāya*...: *upañcu*...: *tam*...: <sup>33</sup> *añcv*<sup>33</sup> *ity*<sup>34</sup> *etāvati*<sup>35</sup> *grhita itareshādm* *aparigrahah*<sup>36</sup> *syāt* <sup>37</sup> *tathāvidhapadasadbhāvāt*: *atho* 'bhayām *grhyate padam ekadeṣa*<sup>38</sup> *ca kiñcīlavat*: *tathā sati padākadeṣe* *shu pañcum*... *ityūdīshu pāpnuuyād anusvārah*<sup>39</sup>: *tac cā 'nish-*

intent of prescription. But I have too little confidence in the correctness of this conjecture to be led to attempt amending the text into giving it consistent expression.

### अवग्रह उदानोऽसेऽसायाऽसाभ्यामऽसाविति ॥३०॥

30. Also in *añse*, *añsâya*, *añsabhyâm*, and *añsôu*, when accented on the first syllable.

The term *avagraha* is declared by the commentator to be equivalent here to *âdi* or *padâdi*, ‘beginning of the word.’ This is, of course, wholly and entirely inadmissible, except as we are driven by the irresistible force of circumstances to give it that meaning or none. There has evidently been some blunder committed, but we can hardly venture to attempt its rectification. Not one of the words here cited occurs, or could occur, as *ava-graha*, ‘former member of a compound.’ The restriction is made with reference to *ânsâu* alone, in order to distinguish it from *asôu*. The examples are *dakshine* ‘*ñsa upa dadhâti*’ (v.3.1<sup>5</sup>: O omits *dadhâti*; W. has lost the whole), *cityuñsâya* (vii.3.17: W. has lost *city*), *añsabhyân svâha* (vii.3.16<sup>2</sup>), and *uttare* ‘*ñsâv eva prati dadhâti*’ (v.3.1<sup>5</sup>: O. reads *tishthati* for *dadhâti*, but doubtless by a copyist’s error only); the counter-example is *usâv abravîc citra-vihitâ* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word); *añsabhyâm* alone is found more than once in the text (namely, again at v.7.13).

### नासावा नासावा ॥३१॥

31. But not in *asâv* *â*.

There is a single passage where the pronoun *usânu*, in the vocative case, stands at the beginning of a clause, and is, accordingly, accented on the first syllable; hence the necessity of the present rule, establishing an exception under its predecessor. The passage is *brûyâd usâv è ’hi’ ’ty evám evâ* (ii.4.9<sup>3</sup>: O. alone has *eva*; G. M. omit also *evam*, and B. blunderingly reads instead of it *atra*).

The Prâtiçâkhyâ’s rehearsal of the cases of interior *anusvâra* is,

30. *avagraha* *âdir* *ity arthah*: *yudi*<sup>1</sup> *padâdir* *udâttuh* *syât tarhy*  
*añse*<sup>2</sup> ----- *ity eteshu*<sup>3</sup> *syâdd* *anusvârâgamuh*. *itiçabdah* *svarû-pavâci*. *dakshine*-----<sup>2</sup> *city*-----: *añsâ*-----: *uttare*-----  
*âdir* *uddatta* *iti kim*: *asâv*-----

<sup>1</sup> B. *pari*. <sup>2</sup> W. *om.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-shâmî*.

31. *adyudâtte*<sup>1</sup> *saty apy*<sup>2</sup> <sup>3</sup>*asâv e ’ty*<sup>3</sup> *usmin* ‘*grahañe na khalu*<sup>4</sup>  
*syâdd* *anusvârâgamah*. *brûyâd*-----

*iti tribhâshyaratne*<sup>5</sup> *prâtiçâkhyavivarane*  
*shodñço*<sup>6</sup> ‘*dhayâyah*.

<sup>1</sup> W. *yady ud-*; B. *yady udâttave*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *om.* <sup>3</sup> W. *usiv* *ii ty*; B. *asâu*; G. M. O. *asâv* *ity*. <sup>4</sup> O. *om.* <sup>5</sup> B. *gritri*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. *dvitiyaprañe caturtho*.

(v.6.1<sup>2</sup>), *yam kāmāni kāmayate* (vii.1.1<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. substitute *yam kāmayeta*, i.6.10<sup>4</sup> et al.), *vañcate parivañcate* (iv.5.3<sup>1</sup>), and *mūnīnd rūpāñi'ndrena* (vii.3.14); but O. introduces after the first *tāñi te dadhāmi* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>) and *martyāñ aviveça* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>), and substitutes for the last two *prāñ prā' dravat* (v.7.10<sup>1</sup>). Counter-examples, of the weaker utterance, are *rūkmām upa dadhāti* (v.2.7<sup>2</sup>: but W. substitutes, by an evident blunder, *kūrmām upadādhāti*, v.2.8<sup>5</sup>), *tigñam āyudham* (iv.7.15<sup>4</sup>), and *suglokañi sumāñ galāñi* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>); O. giving instead of the last *sa imāñ lokam* (i.5.9<sup>4</sup>), and spoiling the whole illustration by adding, “in these likewise it is stronger.” The first two counter-examples are evidently given for the *yama* which, by xxi.12, is to be inserted between the mute and nasal in each: the last is a case falling under xv.8, which prescribes nasalization of a protracted final *a*. The other nasal sounds are the *ndśikya* (xxi.14), and the nasal semivowels into which *m* and *n* are to be converted (v.26,28) before *l*, *y*, and *v*: these last are instanced by the phrase quoted in O. alone.

The manuscript O. follows an independent course in the exposition of this rule, as of the rest composing the chapter.

## समः सर्वत्रेति कौहलीपुत्रः ॥ २ ॥

2. Kāuhalīputra says that it is the same everywhere.

The comment interprets *samam*, ‘same,’ as signifying here *tivratararam*, which it had explained above as an absolute rather than a relative comparative—‘very excessive,’ rather than ‘more excessive.’ That does not seem likely to be the real meaning. As examples, are cited, rather needlessly, *sañrarāñdāh* (iv.6.1<sup>1</sup> et al.), *samyattāh* (i.5.1<sup>1</sup> et al.), *nyaññ agniç cetavyah* (v.5.3<sup>2</sup>: only O. has *cetavyah*), and *upahātāñi ho* (ii.6.7<sup>2</sup>). O. gives an entirely different, though equivalent, exposition, and only the last two of these examples, with two others, namely *sarvāñ agnīñr apushadah* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>) and *imāñ lokān* (ii.1.3<sup>1</sup>).

The name of the authority quoted is given by G. M. as Kāuhalīyaputra, and by O. as Kohalīputra, in both the text and commentary.

## अनुस्वारे जपिवति भारद्वाजः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Bhāradvāja says it is faint in *anusvāra*.

2. *sarvatrā 'nunāsikavarneshu<sup>1</sup> tivrataratvāñ 'samam iti<sup>2</sup> kdu-*  
*halīputro<sup>3</sup> manyate. sañr-----: samy-----: nyaññ-----: upa-----:* *ityādi.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -sikyav-; G. M. -sikyan v-. <sup>2</sup> W. sarvative 'ti. <sup>3</sup> G. M. (as also in the rule) -liyap-.

O. substitutes for the whole *anusvārottamādishu sarveshu samavīcshenā 'nunāsikyañ syād iti kohalīputra' dāryo manyute sma : tivratarām ity arthaḥ : nyaññ-----: sarvāñ-----: imāñ-----: upa-----*.

*gamatravut*, ‘simple conjunction;’ the second, *sunîglishita*, ‘fused together;’ the third and fourth, only *tîvatrata*, ‘more excessive.’ And it is added at the end (only O. making the statement intelligibly) that in other cases Çaitâyana’s rule (xvii.1) applies.

## व्यञ्जनकालश्च स्वरस्यात्राधिकः ॥५॥

5. And to the vowel is added, in this case, the time of a consonant.

The “and” (*ca*) in the rule is declared to continue the implication of Old Kâundinya’s opinion: according to this authority, here, in the prescription of *anusvâra*, the time of a consonant, half a *mora* (i.37), is to be added to the vowel that is accompanied by *anusvâra*; an example is *yuñjâthân râsabhami yuram* (iv.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.). And “in this case” (*atra*, literally ‘here’) is added in the rule because the prescription of increased quantity is not of force in the cases detailed in the sixteenth chapter, in nasal mutes, nor where *n* or *m* is converted into *l* (v.25,26,28).

O. states the same thing in other language, giving two additional examples, *catrûñr anapavyayantaḥ* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>) and *añhomuce* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup> et al.)—of which the latter, being one of those established in the sixteenth chapter (xvi.29), ought to be a counter-example—and remarking further that in the opinion of other teachers the *anusvâra* merely was added to the vowel. *Anusvâra*, namely, was declared by i.34 to have the quantity of a short vowel; and we should be grateful if the commentator had pointed out in what relation this rule really stands to that; if, indeed, there is any connection between them, and if this does not belong properly to a doctrine that regards the *anusvâra* as an affection of the vowel merely; causing the latter’s prolongation, to be sure, but not adding an element with independent quantity to it. O. appends the further restriction that the vowel undergoing prolongation is to be a simple one (not a diphthong). And it mentions another interpretation, as put forward by some authorities: that *atra* signifies wherever *anusvâra* is prescribed: and that where there is *unusvâra*, there the quantity of the vowel is to be short in every case.

---

5. cakâru sthavirakâuñdinyum<sup>1</sup> unvâdiguti: atrâ 'nuscârari-dhâne sînunâsikasvarasya vyañjanakâlo hrasvârdhakâlo 'dhikâh syâd iti sthavirâh kâuñdinyo manyate: yuñj---- ityâdi. atrâi 'va svarasye 'ti kîm: srâdishu 'ttameshû 'ttumalabhâve<sup>2</sup> cai<sup>3</sup> 'tad adhikakâlavidhânam<sup>4</sup> mû bhûd iti.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -rah kâu-; G. M. -nyamatam. <sup>2</sup> W. B. -mâbhâ-. <sup>3</sup> B. nai; G. M. vai.  
<sup>4</sup> W. adhikâl-; G. M. udhikâl-.

O. substitutes for the whole *atra* ‘*nusvâre vyañjanakilo hrasvârdhakilamâtrah svarasyâ 'dhiko bhavati svarakâlât*: *catr----*: *añh----*: *yuñj----*: *cañpâda sthavirâkâuñdinyamatañvâdiguti*: *itarâcâryamatañ nusvâra eva svarasvâ 'dhika syât*: *utre 'ti kîm*: *srâdishu 'ttumesu 'ttumalabhâve s'mâñkshardâshu cai 'tad adhikâlavidhâna mû bhûd teshu svarakâlîdhiko 'nusvâra syât*: *apara iluh aitre 'tyanunisi-karividhâna ity arthat*: *anusvârbhâve 'pi vyañjanakâlo hrasvâkilo bhavati yaddâ 'nusvâras tadâ sarvatra hrasvâkila eva syât*.

As example, is cited the first phrase of the Sanhitâ, *is he two "rje tvâd* (i.1.1: only O. has the last two words).

The manuscripts of the commentary leave us quite in a quandary as to the value of these seven rules, W. B. calling them approved, but G. M. O. unapproved.

नातिव्यक्तं न चाव्यक्तमेवं वर्णानुदिङ्ग्येत् ।  
पयःपूर्णमिवामत्रः दृग्न्धीरो यथामति ॥  
इत्यात्रेय आत्रेयः ॥ ८ ॥

8. Âtreya says, one must utter the sounds not over-distinctly and not indistinctly; taking, as it were, a vessel filled with drink, steady, according to the sense.

The commentator gives only a simple paraphrase of this verse, and casts no real light upon its meaning, even as regards the naïve and not very instructive comparison in the second line.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

CONTENTS: 1-7, opinions of various authorities as to the mode of utterance of the auspicious syllable *om*.

7. *sarvavarnândam prayogah<sup>1</sup> svocitaprayatnaviceshâd<sup>2</sup> dr̄dhapravatnataro<sup>3</sup> bhavati 'ti gâityâyananyo manyate. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: is he----ityâdi.*

<sup>5</sup>nâi 'tâni<sup>6</sup> saptâ sâtrâni<sup>7</sup> 'shtâni.

<sup>1</sup> B. -ga. <sup>2</sup> B. syoc.; W. B. -shû; G. M. -shât. <sup>3</sup> W. -tnah prayatnalamo; B. -tnah prayatnaro. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> W. B. etâni.

O. substitutes for the whole gâityâyanasyâ "câryasya mate svaprayatnaviceshâdith sarvavarnânâni vâisheshyâd dr̄dhopravatnatarah evam varneshu bhavati : na svâsvâravikramayor eve 'ti : yathâ : is he---- nai 'tâni etc.

8. *ativyaktam<sup>1</sup> atispashṭam avyaktam aspashṭam ca<sup>2</sup> yathâ na bhavaty evam varnân udîriguyed ucâdrayed 'ity arthah<sup>3</sup>: payah-pûrnam ivâ<sup>4</sup> 'matram kshîrapûritam<sup>5</sup> bhâjanum<sup>6</sup> 'harann iva<sup>7</sup> yathâmati matim<sup>8</sup> anatikramya 'dhîro 'dhyetâ<sup>9</sup> bhaved<sup>10</sup> ity âtreyo manyate.*

*iti tribhâshyaratne prânicâkhyavivarane  
saptadaço<sup>11</sup> 'dhyâyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. nâ 'tiv-. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> O. om. iva. <sup>5</sup> W. kshîram apû-; B. -iraparipû-; O. -iran pû-. <sup>6</sup> G. M. amabram. <sup>7</sup> O. pârañiva. <sup>8</sup> W. O. m. <sup>9</sup> W. O. om. dhîro; G. M. adhyatâ yaithâ dhîro. <sup>10</sup> G. M. -vei tahe. <sup>11</sup> G. M. O. dvitiyapraçne pañcamo.

only eleven. This is a very strange fact, and calls for a wider examination of Tāittirīya manuscripts, to see if any of them have saved the lost final word.

Then is quoted a verse "from the Kālanirñaya," to the effect that "the quantity of two and a half *moras* belongs to the *pranava* and to a vowel forming the beginning or end (?) of a passage that one reads in the Veda, also at the end of a chapter or section." The Kālanirñaya quoted here and below must, of course, be a very different work from that of Mādhava bearing the same title (Weber's Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS., No. 1166).

In explanation of the word *tu* in the rule, another half-verse, from which I extract no suitable meaning, is quoted from the Kālanirñaya, and the authority of Pāṇini is further appealed to to prove that among the diphthongs there is no short quantity: hence for simple *o* long quantity is determined: here, "however" (*tu*), when the diphthong stands in *pranava*, that quantity is negatived; and (quoting, apparently, another half-verse) for the *pranava*, as occurring in the Veda, is prescribed long quantity along with [the quantity of?] a *m.* That is to say, the *tu* intimates a denial of the ordinary quantity of the diphthong *o*. And the remark is finally added that a difference of quantity is to be recognized in the different *pranavas*.

**उदात्तानुदात्तस्वरितानां कस्मिञ्श्चिदिति शैत्यायनः ॥ २ ॥**

2. Āśtīyāyana says it is to be uttered with either one of acute, grave, or circumflex.

The comment simply paraphrases the rule, adding nothing in its explanation—not even telling us in what relation it stands to rule 7, and whether Āśtīyāyana would let us give the word, in any given case of its use, whatever accent we chose, or would have us governed by reasons in our choice between the three accents.

*nirūpitaḥ<sup>22</sup>: iha tu<sup>23</sup> pranavasthatvavīcheshend<sup>24</sup> 'śdu kālo nishidhyate: nedasthapranave<sup>25</sup> tu syāt<sup>26</sup> "samakāradvīmātrate"<sup>27</sup> 'ti. "pranavavīcheshe kālavīcheshah<sup>27</sup> pratyetavyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -ve; G. M. -vena. <sup>2</sup> W. B. omka. <sup>3</sup> O. -tiyamāvate. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. ins. iii. <sup>6</sup> W. ardhatriyamātram bruvate : pranave. okdrām. <sup>7</sup> B. O. ardha. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. mātre. <sup>9</sup> G. M. -tiyas tam; O. tiyamā tam : sdrdhadvimātra ity arthah. <sup>10</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. sam---: om: ye---: om: om: ish---: om: brah---: om: bhad---: om: ái---: om: O. sam---: yo---: ish---: brah---. <sup>12</sup> B. ins. ca. <sup>13</sup> B. pranavasvaratasya <sup>14</sup> B. adhyāyār cā. <sup>15</sup> G. M. -kasya tu ante 'tō' rdhātr-; O. -tiye tā. <sup>16</sup> B. nug-; G. M. antāc. <sup>17</sup> G. M. -dañ ca pr-; O. -dam cū prāpavām. <sup>18</sup> O. -svo na' sii. <sup>19</sup> W. om. iii. <sup>20</sup> O. okārasya. <sup>21</sup> W. G. M. -le. <sup>22</sup> G. M. -te. <sup>23</sup> B. om. <sup>24</sup> O. -shād; G. M. -shānd. <sup>25</sup> W. B. O. -sya pr-. <sup>26</sup> B. -kālo dv-; G. M. -kāle dv-; O. -kāre dvimātrede. <sup>27</sup> G. M. pranavasya vīchesah.

2. *uddāttānuddāttasvaritāndm madhye kasmīn cit svare pranavah prayoktavya iti āśtīyāyano brūte. yathā: om.*

O. substitutes utte anudattē svarite vā eshā madhyātmena svareṇa prayoktavya syād i āśtīyāyanamākādāryo manyate : os os.

combination of high and low tone. The relation of *vāk* in the compound is described as that of a locative case, and the word is paraphrased by *vācaḥ sthāne*, ‘in position (i. e., I presume, ‘quality’ or ‘temperament’: compare xxii.11, xxiii.4,5) of voice.’

### स्वरितः प्रादिप्नाकायणयोः ॥५॥

5. According to Plākshi and Plākshāyana, it is circumflexed.

This rule is, along with its three predecessors, pronounced by the commentator unapproved.

### उदात्तो वाल्मीकिः ॥६॥

6. According to Vālmīki, it is acute.

This is the only rule in the chapter, except the first, which the commentator allows to stand as approved. In his school, then, the vowel part of the sacred exclamation is to be two and a half *moras* long, and of acute tone. This agrees with the teaching of the Vāj. (ii.51) and Rik (xv.3) Prāticākhyas, save that these give (what is really equivalent to the same thing) three *moras* to the whole word *om*; and the Rik Pr. mentions other opinions both as to its quantity and its accent.

### यथाप्रयोगं वा सर्वेषां यथाप्रयोगं वा सर्वेषाम् ॥७॥

7. All allow that it may also be according to the application.

The commentator first quotes an absurd opinion of Māhisheya’s, to the effect that *yathāprayogam*, ‘according to the application,’ here means *udātta*, ‘acute;’ but then goes on to set forth, as given by Vararuci, what appears to be the real meaning of the rule: namely, that with whatever tone the passage to be read [i. e. its beginning] is used, that tone is to be given also to the introductory exclamation. Thus, before *ishē tvā* (i.1.1 et al.), which begins with

4. *prayujyata iti prayogah: madhyameno 'ccanīcasamāhāravicasakshanena prayatnena pranavoh*<sup>1</sup>: *yatra<sup>2</sup> kvacana vāca sthāne<sup>3</sup> prayogo bhavati. sa<sup>4</sup> iti kāndinyābhimataḥ pūrvokto grhyate. vāci prayogo vākprayogaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -vi; G. M. -yah *prayuktaryah*. <sup>2</sup> W. *anya*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. -na. <sup>4</sup> B. om.

O. substitutes *ko 'yam prapno nūma cāvaprayogah* [i. e. *vdkpr-*] *kāndinyamatam ādīya yat/a kvacana sthāne dryste* : *tenu madhyamena sverena prayuktavyah*.

5. *plākshiplākshāyanayoh<sup>1</sup> pakshe<sup>2</sup> svarito bhavati.*

*nāi 'tat sātracatushtayam ishtam.*

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *dcāryayor*. <sup>2</sup> O. *mate*; G. M. O. add *prapava*.

6. *vālmiker mate prapava udātto bhavati.<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> O. adds *yathā*.

lowing circumflex.' He adds examples of a *vikrama* syllable in each of the four defined positions: namely *yō sya svō* 'gnis tám ápi (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>; G. M. O. omit the last two words), *vódhavé* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), *dhárvand gáh* (iv.6.6<sup>1</sup>), and *tásya kvā suvargó lokáh* (ii.6.5<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word, G. M. the last two). In the third example, the circumflex by which the *vikrama* syllable is preceded is the enclitic; this shows us (what we should have inferred without it) that, as regards the application of the present precept, no distinction is made between the independent and the enclitic circumflex. As an example of the use of the term, and showing the necessity of its definition here, is quoted rule xvii.6, where we are told that Pāushkarasādi asserts the utterance of *svára* ('circumflex') and *vikrama* with a firmer effort. The word occurs elsewhere only at xxiii.20 and xxiv.5, where we have no assurance that it signifies the same thing as here. It is found, among the other Prātiçākhyas, in that to the Rig-Veda only, and has there no such meaning.

The *vikrama* is marked by the usual sign of low tone, the horizontal stroke beneath. The following rule, as we shall see, extends its definition so as to include nearly all the syllables so marked.

The construction of *sa* in the rule, as agreeing in gender with *vikramah*, though referring to *nīcam* (*aksharam*), was alluded to above, under v.2.

## प्रचयपूर्वश्च कौपिडन्यस्य ॥२॥

2. As also, according to Kāundinya, when a *pracaya* precedes.

The *pracaya* (see xxi.10,11) is the series of unaccented syllables following a circumflex (enclitic or independent) in connected discourse, and uttered, save the one next preceding another following circumflex or an acute, in the tone of acute. This last one of the

1. <sup>1</sup>*yatra* <sup>2</sup>*svaritayor* <sup>3</sup>*madhya* <sup>4</sup>*uddāttayor* <sup>5</sup>*vā* <sup>6</sup>*nyatarato* <sup>7</sup>*ve* <sup>8</sup>*'ti* *svaritodāttayor* <sup>9</sup>*ve* <sup>10</sup>*'ty arthah*: <sup>11</sup>*udāttasvaritayor* <sup>12</sup>*vā* <sup>13</sup>*madhye* *nīcam* *yad aksharam* *sa* *vikramo* <sup>14</sup>*bhavati*. *svaritayor* <sup>15</sup>*madhye* *yathā*: *yō*.... <sup>16</sup>*uddāttayor* *yathā*: <sup>17</sup>*vōdhavē*. *svaritodāttayor* *yathā*: *dhanv*.... <sup>18</sup>*udāttasvaritayor* *yathā*: *tasya*.... *vikramasāñjñāyāh* *prayojanam*: *svárvikramayor* *dṛḍha-prayatnatara* (xvii.6) *iti*.

<sup>1)</sup> O. *yad dvayor*. <sup>2)</sup> B. G. M. ins. *sthale*. <sup>3)</sup> G. M. ins. *vā*. <sup>4)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5)</sup> G. M. om. *vā*. <sup>6)</sup> G. M. ins. *'ti* *vā*. <sup>7)</sup> O. om.; G. M. put after *madhye*. <sup>8)</sup> G. M. *-masam jñō*. <sup>9)</sup> O. *tayor*. <sup>10)</sup> O. om.

2. *cakdro*<sup>1</sup> *vikrama* *iti* *jñāpayati*: <sup>2</sup>*kāundinyasya mata udāttaparāḥ svaritaparo* *vā* *pracayapūrvāc ca vikramo vijñeyāḥ*. *udāttaparāḥ* *yathā*: *pary*....<sup>3</sup> *svaritaparāḥ* *yathā*: *upar*.... *pracayāḥ* *pūrvo* *yasmād* <sup>4</sup>*asāu* *pracayapūrvāḥ*.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> G. M. O. *cakabdo*. <sup>2)</sup> W. om. <sup>3)</sup> G. M. *sa tathoktāḥ*.

depression comes by vicinage from rule 1, above, where a syllable of low tone between two that are circumflexed is spoken of. This seems to me entirely inadmissible. In *yama* as a synonym of *sva-rīta*, and meaning ‘circumflex,’ I cannot in the least believe; and the designation of a case of three successive circumflexes as *dvi-yamapara* would be excessively awkward, even without the omission of the *ca*, ‘and,’ which would be needed to connect it, in that signification, with *dviyama*. On the other hand, *dviyama*, ‘of double pitch,’ is an entirely natural and acceptable synonym for *svarita*, ‘circumflex,’ the essential characteristic of which is that it combines the high and the low tone within the limits of the same syllable; and “a circumflex followed by a circumflex” includes every possible case. The limitation “at the end” is properly enough left to be understood from the nature of the case; but that the predicate “depressed,” the most important part of the precept, should remain to be inferred by vicinage only, and from the subject, not the predicate, of the two preceding rules, is not to be tolerated. And I have no doubt that the *tāh* in the rule is the predicate, and represents *vikrama*, its gender and number being adapted to those of *anumātrāh* by the grammatical figure *anyonyānvaya*, to which the commentator (see under ii.7, v.2) has several times appealed in other like cases. There remains, as the only difficulty, the plural number of both words: we should certainly expect rather *sā ‘numātrā*; but even if we have to let this pass unexplained, it is vastly more easy to get along with than the difficulties which beset the other interpretation. One hardly dares presume to suggest that the present reading is the result of an alteration, made after the meaning given in the comment was ascribed to the rule.

The commentator goes on to quote a verse from the Çikshā, to the effect that the four kinds of independent circumflex (see xx.1, 2, 4, 5) suffer *kampa* when they precede either an acute or a circumflex. This verse is (save that it gives the Tāittirīya instead of the Rik names to the accents) the same with that which is interpolated in the Rik Pr., at the end of the third chapter (iii.19). He adds further, in another half-verse, doubtless from the same authority, that “of the remainder, there may either be the quality of acute or of circumflex, respectively;” and explains this “respectively” as

---

*vyavasthācubdendā 'nena<sup>20</sup> dvividhah kampa uktāḥ : sunihitāyām  
svaritakampa<sup>21</sup> itaravedabhāgā<sup>22</sup> udāttakampa<sup>23</sup> iti ye<sup>24</sup> kampāḥ  
prasiddhās<sup>25</sup> teshv<sup>26</sup> etal lakṣaṇām na tu kampavidhāyakam :  
anyathā yo---- ityādāu kampāḥ prasajyeta.*

*ne 'dāñ sūtram ishtum.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *dviy-*   <sup>2</sup> W. *norañ-*; O. *noraitatory-*   <sup>3</sup> G. M. *tritiyayame*.   <sup>4</sup> W. *yām*; M. *vā*.   <sup>5</sup> O. *-tra*.   <sup>6</sup> W. *niyatā*; B. *abhihūtā*; G. M. *'bhītā*.   <sup>(7)</sup> O. om.   <sup>8</sup> O. *auta*.  
<sup>9</sup> O. *ka*.   <sup>10</sup> W. B. *yāhā*.   <sup>11</sup> O. *hi hat-*.   <sup>12</sup> G. *nihit-*; O. *-tatvāñ*.   <sup>13</sup> B. om.   <sup>14</sup> O. *-te*.   <sup>15</sup> B. *-hitaç*.   <sup>16</sup> G. M. *svar-*.   <sup>17</sup> W. *trasv-*; M. *ccadeçasv-*; O. *casasyasv-*; G. M. *-yadd*; O. *-ye*.   <sup>18</sup> O. om.   <sup>19</sup> B. *-tor*; G. M. *svarito*.   <sup>20</sup> W. *ite*; O. om. *anena*.  
<sup>21</sup> W. *-tāk k-*; B. *-ta uktāh k-*.   <sup>22</sup> G. M. *-re ve-*.   <sup>23</sup> W. *-tāk k-*.   <sup>24</sup> W. B. O. om.  
<sup>25</sup> G. M. om.   <sup>26</sup> B. O. ins. *eva*.

the figure represents the quantity that is added to the syllable to make room for the *vikrama* tone at the end, and it gets, therefore, the *vikrama* sign. Thirdly, in the only two passages (vi.3.4<sup>2</sup>; 6. 8<sup>1</sup>) in which the vowel of the circumflexed syllable is short, it is made long.

What the commentator means by declaring the rule of no force, it is not easy to say. It can hardly be that his school acknowledged no *kampa* at all; and we should have expected him rather to interpret into his text the usage which he and his fellow-*çākhanah* accepted as proper—as he has done in so many other cases. There appears to be no discordance between the teachings of the Prātiçākhya in this chapter and the practice in the known Tāittiriya text (but see the note on the next rule); the former, to be sure, do not fully explain the latter; but this is the case also with the other Vedas.

The denial of *kampa* in a circumflex syllable before an acute constitutes the most important and conspicuous peculiarity in the Tāittiriya system of accentuation as compared with that of the Rik and Atharvān, and also puts the former at a disadvantage in respect to clearness. Its effect is to deprive us of any constant means of distinguishing whether the syllable following a circumflex is an acute, or a grave with *pracaya* tone (xxi.10); and whether that distinction shall be shown at all depends upon mere accident. For example, *sò 'smá'dt* and *sò 'smá't* would be accented before a pause precisely alike; and so with any number of acutes or graves following a circumflex before a pause: e. g. *sò 'smá'd abhávut* and *sò 'smá'd yò rá'i tát.*\* And even if, instead of a pause, other syllables follow, there must be at least two grave syllables in succession to bring out the true condition of things: we see that the syllable after the circumflex is acute in *hy éshá prthi-vyá'h*, but not in *hy étád devá'h*, and the *sanhitá* does not tell us whether in *so 'smá'd eturhi* the *asmá't* is accented or toneless.† And so often does this ambiguity arise, that in the first chapter of the third book there are not less than twenty cases of *pracayas*, all whose syllables except the last admit of being understood as true acutes.‡ Other possible cases of ambiguity, of less frequency and importance, I pass without notice.

This same peculiarity belongs also to the existing Tāittiriya-Brāhmaṇa and Āranyaka, so that the commentator's allusion to “other parts of the Veda” as differing from the *Sanhitá* in respect to *kampa* is of doubtful meaning.

\* Thus. सो ऽस्मादभवत् । and सो ऽस्माद्यो वि तत् ।

† Thus, क्षेष पृथिव्या: and क्षेत्रद्वेवा: and सो ऽस्मादेतद्विं

‡ Thus, सो ऽकामयत प्रजा: may be either *sò 'kamayaia prajá'h* or *sò 'ká'mayáta prajá'h*.

*vikrama*, there given, does not apply here in the rule for *kampa*, since, by xvii.6, *vikrama* is uttered with a firmer effort of the organs, while that is not the case with *kampa*. There is nothing in either of these proposals to commend it to our acceptance. If we were ourselves to guess, we should perhaps say that the reference was to rule 4 only, which teaches *kampa* without any protraction, and that this was confessed to be a doctrine not before authoritatively taught. But we should not presume to put the conjecture forward with any confidence:

## CHAPTER XX.

CONTENTS: 1-8, names of the different kinds of circumflex, independent and enclitic; 9-12, different degrees of force of their utterance.

## इवणीकारयोर्घवकारभावे क्लैप्र उदात्तयोः ॥ १ ॥

1. When *i*, *ī*, and *u* are converted into *y* or *v*, the accent is *kshāiprī*, if they were acute.

The conversion of *i*, *ī*, and *u* into *y* or *v* is by rule x.15; *u* does not fall under such a rule on account of its being always *pragrahā* (iv.5). Rule x.16 prescribes the conditions under which a circumflex accent is the result of such a conversion; and the addition of *uddāttayoh* to the present rule is wholly unnecessary—a case to exercise the ingenuity of the commentator in defending the treatise from the charge of *pūnaraktya*: but either it escapes his notice, or he declines to touch it, as beyond his powers. Of course, if it be necessary to explain here that the altered vowel is acute, it needs to be added that the following vowel is grave

5. *'pūrvāgāstram nāma vikramavidhiḥ'*: *tasminn etad anukar-yam na bhavati. evam vā sūtrārthaḥ*: *pūrvāgāstre<sup>2</sup> 'dhyāya-prathamasūtre yā vikramasamjñō 'ktā<sup>3</sup> sā kampavidhāv atru<sup>4</sup> na bhavati: vikramusya dṛḍhaprayatnatvāt<sup>5</sup> kampasya tadabhāvād iti.*<sup>6</sup>

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarane  
ekonavinco<sup>6</sup> 'dhyāyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -strānam api kram-; B. -stre 'pi yo vikr-; O. -dhiva. <sup>2</sup> O. -rasātre. <sup>3</sup> W. -dhāv yatra; G. M. sā 'tra pracayavidhāv; O. sā kampavidhāyakatoam. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -tratara syat. <sup>5</sup> G. M. add dvāv arthāt. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. dvitiyapraśne septimo.

1. *uddāttayor ivarṇokārayor yathopadeśam<sup>1</sup> yavakārabhāve sati  
yah svarito vihitāḥ sa kshāipra iti samjñāyate<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>: vy-----  
kr̥dhī----- uddāttayor<sup>4</sup> iii kim: vas-----: anv-----.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -pātīr; O. -ṣe. <sup>2</sup> G. M. jñā jāyate. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. -tta.

reads *-cām*], but no such word is to be found in the Sanhitā, and it is probably only a blundering repetition of *nyañcam*), and *kvā jágati ca* (vii.1.4<sup>2</sup>); and, from the *jutā*-text, *kvā 'syā 'syā kvā 1 kvā 'syā* (v.7.4<sup>2</sup>: B. has lost a part; it involves a case of *kampa*, with resulting prolongation, and use of the sign 1: see xix.3). Counter-examples are given in O. only: namely, of a circumflex not found in *pada*-text, *vy èvā'i 'nena* (v.8.11<sup>3</sup>: the MS. has *veryāi*), *drvānnah sarpih* (iv.1.9<sup>2</sup>; p. *drū-annah*); of one which has an acute before it, *mártýāñ ávivéga* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>) and *sárvāñ agní'n* (v.6. 1<sup>2</sup>). We have also one of the common attempts to give a profound significance to the word *tu*, 'but,' in the rule; and, as usual, it is abortive, involving difficulties which the commentator only pretends to get rid of. He says the *tu* signifies that, so far as the *nitya* circumflex etc. (i. e. and the other varieties of the independent circumflex) are concerned, the exception laid down in rule xiv. 31—namely, that the circumflex character is not retained before a following acute or circumflex—has no force. But it is objected, with entire reason, that rule xiv.31 has nothing to do with the *nitya* at all, but only with the enclitic accent prescribed in rule xiv.29. His reply is, that in the condition of complete separation of sounds, there is, after all, a grave element preceded by an acute, as required in rule xiv.29, the combination of the two, by i.40, giving the circumflex character. Whether this implies his recognition of the fact that the semivowel in every *nitya* syllable really represents an acute vowel, pronounced as such in an earlier stage of the language—*kvā* being equivalent to *kúa*, and *kanyā* to *kanidā*—admits of question. He expounds *unudāttapurve* as a descriptive instead of a possessive compound, and *apūrve* as a substantive of the same character, as if the construction were 'there being a preceding grave, or there being no preceding accent;' it is doubtless better to supply in idea *tasmī'n akshare*, and to render 'when that syllable is' etc. The remaining bit of exposition is much corrupted in its readings, and the drift of it is not clear to me. O. brings it in very differently from the rest, and makes it involve an additional example, *yájyā'i "vā'i 'nam* (ii.3.5<sup>3</sup>; p. *yájyā': á': evā : enam*).

---

*púrvatvad<sup>15</sup> svaritasye 'ti nishedhavishayatvam. unudāttac cā 'sdu púrvac cā' nudlītāpúrvah: <sup>16</sup> tasmin: <sup>17</sup> púrvābhāvo 'púrrah: tasmin<sup>17</sup>. <sup>18</sup> cūnye tu sarvatrapúrvatrádt<sup>18</sup> púrvatvaviceshaṇadvayaṣyād<sup>19</sup> 'nyathā<sup>20</sup> vāiyarthyāt<sup>21</sup>: tasmāt tatra<sup>22</sup> nityasavaritvatvam<sup>23</sup> eva na<sup>24</sup> samjñāntaram iti vijñeyam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om.; G. M. add *yatra* *svaryate*. <sup>2</sup> O. ins. *vā*. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *vā*. <sup>5</sup> G. om. <sup>6</sup> O. *pi*. <sup>7</sup> W. B. ins. : *anyañcam* <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. -*darkav-*; O. -*shayo*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *na tu*. <sup>10</sup> O. *nish-*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. ins. *svaritrm*. <sup>12</sup> O. *laksh-*. <sup>13</sup> all MSS. have the linguistic *L*. <sup>14</sup> W. -*rvam*. <sup>15</sup> W. B. *ucyate pú-* <sup>16</sup> W. ins. *tasmāt*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. om. <sup>18</sup> O. *na cūnya ity arthah* : *sthite pada iti kim* : *vy-----: drv-----: anudāttapúrvatviti kim* : *mar-----: sar-----: kicid ev m úcuh* : *yáj-----ity ádi* : *prátihañniça-karṇy evakáraḥ* : *puñ-samucrāye anudāttapúrvatvāt*; G. M. *cūnyapúrvavasapúrvatvāt*; W. . . . *sarvatrā*; B. *bhūnye* etc. <sup>19</sup> W. *púrvaviceshv-dv*; B. *púrvatraviceshanād*; O. *púrvavici*. <sup>20</sup> O. *ntathā*. <sup>21</sup> W. -*thyam*; G. M. -*thyām syāt*. <sup>22</sup> W. *am*; B. *tat*; O. *tra*. <sup>23</sup> W. O. *nityatvam*; B. *svaritatvam* *nityatvam*. <sup>24</sup> B. *ca*.

If this be indeed the original intent of the rule, it would seem that, to the apprehension of the Hindu phonetists, there was difference enough between the enclitic circumflex which *te* in *tám te* assumes in *sainhitā*, having been grave in *pada*-text, and that which the *shāh* of *dūgcākshāh* has in *sainhitā* as well as in *pada*, to furnish ground for a difference of classification and nomenclature.\* But there are various obstacles in the way of our accepting the interpretation as satisfactory. In the first place, why ought not the same distinction to apply where the acute and circumflex are separated by a hiatus, as well as by consonants? or why, when a circumflex after an acute in the same word is called *tāirovyanjana*, alike whether a hiatus or consonants intervene, should a circumflex after an acute in another word have a different name according as it is preceded by a consonant or not? In the second place, why should the rule be thrust in here, wholly out of connection with the others respecting the enclitic circumflex, and with such a frightful sacrifice of that economy of expression which the *sātrakāra* proverbially rates so highly? for, following rule 7, a simple *nānāpadasthāt tu prātihataḥ* would have done the whole business, and much more unequivocally. Not one of the other treatises mixes together thus the enclitic and independent *svaritas*, when they come to be defined and named. Nor, again, does any other authority found a separate species of accent upon the basis here laid down. I have been inclined, therefore, to conjecture that the rule ought to be rendered ‘when there is besides (*apि*) a [preceding] acute in another word, then, provided a circumflex arises as the result of a rule of combination, it is *prātihata*.’ understanding an independent *svarita* (except a *nitya*) to be intended, whenever that *svarita* was preceded by an acute, and so held a position which would make it an enclitic *svarita* as well; and the reason for thus calling attention to it being that, as written, it is not distinguished from a mere enclitic accent.† But there are too many difficulties connected with this interpretation also to allow of its being accepted as at all satisfactory.

The Vajasaneyi-Prātiçākhya (i.118) gives a special name, *tāiro-virāma*, to the enclitic circumflex which falls in the *pada*-text upon the first syllable of the second member of a compound, under

\* And this difference, it should be noted, applies in the same manner where division is made between the two parts of a compound word; for the extant Tāittirīya *pada*-text, in marked contrast with those of the other Vedas, regards the *avagraha* pause as suspending, like the *acusana*, all accentual influence, and writes *rukṝ-vati*, for example, in the same fashion as it writes *rukṝdm* : *asti*—that is to say.

**शुक्रं वृत्ती ।** instead of **शुक्रः वृत्ती**, as the rest would read.

† For example, *ghṛtiś'ir vy udyaṭe* (iii.1.114) and *ānacānāḥ svishṭim* (iii.1.92) are written precisely as if they were *ghṛlāś'ir vy udyaṭe* and *ānacānāḥ svishṭim*; namely,

**घृतैव्युद्यते** and **आनशानाः स्विष्टिम्**: this is an ambiguity which is common to all the Vedic texts.

## तस्माद्कारलोपे अभिनिहृतः ॥८॥

4. After such a one, in case of the loss of an *a*, it is *abhinihata*.

The word *tasmâd* the comment explains as bringing down *nândapadastham udâttam* from the preceding rule: ‘after an acute occurring in another word.’ But the specification (like that of *udâttayoh* in rule 1) is wholly unnecessary: rule xii.9 prescribes the circumflex and defines its conditions: here we need only to have given us the name by which it is to be called.

O. has an independent exposition, but of equivalent meaning.

The examples are *sô 'bravît* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *tè 'bruvan* (ii.5.1<sup>2</sup> et al.); and a counter-example, where, as the eliding diphthong is not acute, no circumflex results, is *bhrâ'jo 'si devî'nâm* (ii.4.3<sup>2</sup>).

All the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.55) give to this circumflex the name *abhinihita*, of which our own term has the aspect of being an artificial variation.

## अभावे प्रस्त्रिः ॥५॥

5. Where an *û* results, it is *prâglishta*.

Rule x.17 prescribes the circumflex to which the name of *prâglishta* is here assigned; and the examples given are to be found there also, being all the instances save one which the Sanhitâ affords. They read in this place *sûnniyam ira* (vi.2.4<sup>1</sup>), *sûdgâtâ* (vii.1.8<sup>1</sup>), *mâsîl 'tishthan* (vii.5.2<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *mâ*), and *dikshâ' padâdhâti* (v.5.5<sup>4</sup>: G. M. O. omit).

The same name (or, in the Ath. Pr., *prâglishta*) is given by the other treatises to the circumflex which results from the fusion of two short *i*'s, the first acute and the other circumflex (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.56).

## पदविवृत्यां पादवृत्तः ॥६॥

6. Where there is a hiatus between two words, it is *pâdavritta*.

Here there is abrupt change, without notice, from the independent to the enclitic circumflex. The examples given are *tô' asmât srshtâ'ḥ* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup>: B. omits *srshtâḥ*), *sá idhâ'ñâḥ* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>), and *yâ*

4. 'tasman nânâpadasthaudâttat parabhûtânuudâttâkârasya' lope  
suti yah svaritah so 'bhinihato reditavyah'. yathâ: so----: te  
---- tasmâd iti kim: bhrâ'jo----

<sup>1)</sup> O. substitutes *tasmât sînhâ'na na* *na* *svarayamînârdhâ te* : *sadakile asvarita* *ity arîñhâ* : *akâralupte ya svara âlîgyat* : *so 'bhinihato nîma svarito bhavati*. <sup>2)</sup> W. B. -dâttasya; G. M. *parabhûtâd anuudâttasya 'kârasya*.

5. ubhâve yatra svaryate su prâglishta reditavyah. sûn----:  
sûd----: mâsû----: 'dikshâ'----'

<sup>1)</sup> G. M. O. om.

*usi* (i.2.5<sup>2</sup> et al.), *sá īdro 'manyata* (vii.1.5<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *sa*), *tád īgvo 'bhavut* (v.3.12<sup>1</sup>), *prāūgam* (iv.4.2<sup>1</sup>), and *tám tváshṭ́d' "dhat-*ta (i.5.1<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). It is very odd—but, I presume, merely accidental—that in every one of these cases (except *prāūgam*) the vowel which finally shows the circumflex is not of the same word with the acute, but belongs to another word which has been combined with its predecessor, and, after the combination, gets the circumflex by the general rules xiv.29,30 (for the commentator has expressly denied under rule x.12 that the initial grave *a* of *asya*, for example, receives the circumflex in virtue of its combination with the enclitic circumflex *ti* of *yunjáhti*). I do not see why, in the first two cases, at any rate, the circumflex is not *prātihata*, according to the commentator's explanation of the meaning of that term; and should even incline to conjecture that these are the examples selected and current for the present rule before the erroneous interpretation of rule 3 was established.

No one of the other Prātiçākhyas limits *tāirovyāñjana* to an enclitic circumflex following its acute in the same word (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.62); it is quite an oversight, therefore, that the St. Petersburg lexicon gives the term only this restricted meaning (perpetuating Roth's original error, referred to above, in the note to rule 3).

## इति स्वारनामधेयानि ॥ ८ ॥

8. These are the names of the circumflex accents.

The commentator simply gives examples for each accent, in part new, in part the same with those furnished under the rules defining each: namely, for the *kshāipra* (omitted in G. M.), *abhy āsthāt* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>) and *ādhvaryō 'veh*, (vi.4.3<sup>4</sup>: this is a blunder, there being no *kshāipra* in the phrase; B. O. read instead *ādhvaryāh* [vi.2.9<sup>4</sup> et al.], which does not mend the matter); for the *nitya*, *vāyavyām* (i.8.7<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *kvā 'syā* (v.7.4<sup>2</sup>: G. M. have *kvā* simply); for the *prātihata*, *sá te lokāh* (v.7.26: G. M. omit *lokāh*) and *yāt tvā kruddhāh* (i.5.4<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *kruddhāh*); for the *abhinihata*, *sō 'bravīt* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.); for the *prācishṭā*, *sūdgātā* (vii.1.8<sup>1</sup>); for the *pādavṛttā*, *tā enam* (ii.3.11<sup>4</sup>: W. reads, blunderingly, *tám nemīm* [ii.6.11<sup>1</sup>], and B. substitutes *sá idhānāh*, iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>); and for the *tāirovyāñjana*, *máma nāma* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>).

## क्षेप्रनित्यपोर्द्धतरः ॥ ९ ॥

---

8. *ity etāni saptā svaritānāmadheyāny<sup>1</sup> akhyātāni<sup>2</sup>. yathā:*  
*\*abhy----: adhv---- iti kshāiprah<sup>3</sup>. vāy----: kvā---- iti*  
*nityāh. sa----: yat---- iti prātihatah. so---- ity abhinihatah.*  
*sūd---- iti prācishṭāh. ta---- iti pādavṛttāh. mama---- iti*  
*tāirovyāñjanāh.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -māny; B. -yāni svaritānām. <sup>2</sup> O. vyādh-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

*Alpatara*, ‘feeble,’ is doubtless meant to signify a still less degree of force of utterance than *mṛdutara*, ‘gentler.’

To the commentator, his Çikshā appears to be a higher authority than the Prātiçākhya, at least in this part; and he adds that, although the qualifications ‘feeble, gentle, firm’ are here attributed to the accents in question, yet, in accordance with what the Çikshā says, “like a candle, like a rush-leaf” (? unintelligible without the context), it is to be understood that there is softheadedness (?) in them all alike. And O. adds an example, *yuvā kuvih* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>).

## CHAPTER XXI.

CONTENTS: 1–9, division of consonants in syllabication; 10–11, *pracrya* accent; 12–13, *yūmas* or nasal counterparts; 14, *nāsikya*; 15–16, *svarabhakti*.

### व्यञ्जनः स्वराङ्गम् ॥ १ ॥

1. The consonant is adjunct of a vowel.

This brief principle calls forth a long discussion. Reference is first made (except in G. M.) to rule xxiv.5, as, by its requirement of a comprehension of *aṅga*, ‘adjunct’ (literally ‘limb, member’), creating a necessity for the present precept (and for those that are to follow). Objection is then at once taken to the principle: if, in such cases as *kūpa* and *yūpa* (and G. M. add yet other words as illustrations), it is the consonant that indicates the difference of meaning, ought not the vowel, rather, to be considered as adjunct

1. <sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>*vyañjananī svārāngam bhavati: gṛāso nādo 'ngam ena ca* (xxiv.5) *iti vijñeyatvena<sup>2</sup> vidhānād ayam ārambhah. nanu<sup>3</sup> kūpo yūpa<sup>4</sup> ityāddāv uyañjanum evā 'rthavīcēshabodhakam<sup>5</sup> iti svaro vyañjanāngam kim na<sup>6</sup> syat. ucyate: vyañjanam kevalam avasthātuṁ na ṣaknoti: kim tu śāpeksham<sup>7</sup>: svaras tu nirapekshuh<sup>8</sup>: śāpekshanirupekshayor nirapeksham eva viçishṭam acakshate prekshāvantah: viçishṭapratyāngatvam<sup>9</sup> uvigishtasyai<sup>10</sup> 'va. kim ca: svaruvāgiṣhṭyabodhakam anyad api vidyate<sup>11</sup>.*

*durbulusya yathā rāshṭram harate<sup>12</sup> balavān nrpah:*

*durbalām vyañjanam tadvad dharate<sup>13</sup> balavānt svarah.<sup>14</sup>*

<sup>15</sup>*kim ca: gīkshāvāyākhyāne*

*yah svayam rajate tam tu svaram āha patañjalih:*

*uparisthāyind tena vyañgam vyañjanam ucyate.<sup>15</sup>*

*svārās tu<sup>16</sup> brāhmaṇā jñeyā ityādi.*

*uddātag ca 'nudātag ca<sup>17</sup> svaritaç ca svarās trayah<sup>18</sup>:*

*'hrasvo dirghah pluta iti<sup>19</sup> kālato<sup>20</sup> niyamā<sup>21</sup> act<sup>22</sup>*

*'ti<sup>23</sup>*

Next we pass to the consideration of another reason why the principle stated in the rule needed to be laid down. The consonant (by i.37) has half a *mora* of quantity; and a vowel has [for example] a *mora*: their combination, then, would seem to have a *mora* and a half, and so would be liable to be understood as of long quantity: this untoward conclusion is avoided by the present rule, which implies that in fluent utterance the quantity of the vowel belongs in all cases to the combination of consonant and vowel, and not to the vowel alone. The specification “in fluent utterance” (literally, ‘in running action’) is made in order to save the significance of rule i.37.

Finally, the superiority of the vowel is once more inferred from the fact that, when it is combined with a consonant, it alone is perceptible; just as, when milk and water are mingled, the milk alone is perceived, and not the water.

## तत्परस्वरम् ॥२॥

2. And it belongs to the following vowel.

The commentator explains *parasvaram* as a descriptive compound (*karmadhāraya*), governed by *bhajate* understood; such an ellipsis, however, is so violent as to be hardly admissible, and the word is perhaps better taken as a possessive (*bahuvrīhi*), somewhat anomalously used. The occasion of the rule, we are told, is the doubt which is liable to arise as to when the consonant—which, owing to its having the vowel as a superior, is unable to stand by itself—is an adjunct of the preceding, and when of the following vowel. A single phrase is quoted as example, namely *imān eva lokān upadhyāya* (v.5.5<sup>3</sup>; O. omits the last word).

This is the leading and introductory principle in all the Prātiśākhyas (see note to Ath. Pr. i.55); it is greatly restricted in its application by the following rules.

## अवसितं पूर्वस्य ॥३॥

3. A consonant in *pauṣā* belongs to the preceding vowel.

The commentator explains *avasitam* as meaning ‘standing at the end of a *pada*,’ and gives as examples *ark* (i.2.2<sup>2</sup> et al.: W. has instead *r̥k* [iv.7.9<sup>1</sup> et al.], and O. has *v̥k* [i.3.9<sup>1</sup> et al.]), *vashat*

2. *svarapradhānatayā kevalam avasthātum asahamānam*<sup>1</sup> *vyāñjanām kadā pūrvasyā 'ngam*<sup>2</sup> *'kadā parasyā 'ngam*<sup>3</sup> *iti samdehe*<sup>4</sup> *vyavasthāpayati: tad aṅgabhūtan*<sup>5</sup> *vyāñjanam parasvaram bhajate. yathā: imān..... paraç cā 'sdu svaraç ca parasvarah: <sup>7</sup> tām<sup>8</sup> svaraparam<sup>9</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. O. om.; G. M. *kadācid apar-* <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-hañi.*  
<sup>5</sup> W. *añghab-*; O. *egasūtratvii.* <sup>6</sup> B. om. <sup>7</sup> W. ins. *parām svari.* <sup>8</sup> O. om. <sup>9</sup> G.  
M.. O. om.

The manuscripts of the commentary are more than usually defective in this neighborhood: B. has lost the present rule, with something of what precedes and follows it; O. omits the next rule, with passages before and after; W. has done the same, to a somewhat less extent; but rule 5 and the lacking part of its comment were apparently restored on the margin of W.'s original, and its copyist has put them in in the wrong place, next before rule 6.

## परेण चासःकृतम् ॥ ५ ॥

5. And one that is not combined with the following vowel.

The comment supplies the word *svarena*, 'vowel,' as that with which *parena* here agrees, and the whole interpretation is constructed accordingly. The meaning is, then, that (with the exceptions to be further specified in the following rules) only the final member of a group of consonants is to be adjoined to the following vowel, the rest belonging to that which precedes. By way of illustration is given merely *tat savituh* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> et al.): a most insufficient and ill-chosen example; since, in the final form of the group *ts*, only one consonant goes with the preceding syllable: thus, *t-ths*. But the commentator is obliged to spend his strength, and vainly, in endeavoring to refute an obvious objection to the rule itself, which he thus states: "well, but then the foregoing rule is meaningless, since by this one also the quality of adjunction to the preceding vowel is assured to the consonant that begins a group." And he replies, "you must not think that: for, in such cases as *maryacrih* (iv.1.2<sup>5</sup> et al.) and *arvâ 'si* (i.7.8<sup>1</sup> et al.), in which the *y* and *v* are doubled after *r* by rule xiv.4, the former *y* or *v* is by the present rule made an adjunct of the preceding vowel, but the *r*, by rule 7 below, would become an adjunct of the following vowel: and that is impossible, since no such pronunciation ever takes place. So, as one or the other must needs be annulled, the question arises which is to be annulled; and here rule 4 comes in to settle the question."

This is not a very acceptable exposition, although it in a manner involves the true relations. Rule 4 is not meant as a safeguard against the misapplication of following precepts, but as a fundamental principle, with reference to which the present rule stands in a subordinate position; and the two must be understood as if they read "the first member of a group belongs to the preceding vowel; and, along with it, such other members as are not immediately combined with the following vowel." The former principle obtains everywhere, without exception; to the latter, rules 7-9

5. 'parena' *svarenâ 'samhitam<sup>8</sup> asamyuktam<sup>4</sup> vyanjanam<sup>5</sup> pûrvasvarângam bhavati'. yathâ<sup>6</sup>: tat..... nanu tarhi pûrvasûtram anarthakam: samyogddibhâtas�d<sup>7</sup> 'pi vyanjanasyd<sup>8</sup> 'nenai 'va' pûrvasvarângatvasiddheh. mti 'vam mansthâh: maryacrih: arvâ 'si: ity atra yavakârayo rephât param ca* (xiv.

of original simple pairs, there are eighty like *k-ky* (from *ky*) and *k-khsh* (from *ksh*), in which, by rules 7 and 9, only the initial consonant of the finally resulting group goes with the preceding vowel.

When, now, the pairs here rehearsed come to be extended to triplets by the addition of a third member, if that member be a semivowel, or a spirant (sibilant) following a mute, the point of division remains just where it was before. And so also, of course, in the like extension of the groups mentioned under rule 4, above, as undergoing no change in the *varnakrama*. Thus, *ggr* (*g-gr*) is divided like *gg* (*g-g*); *ccy* (*ccc-cy*) like *cc* (*ccc-c*); *ñksh* (*ñ-khsh*) like *ñk* (*ñ-k*); and *rks* (*rk-khs*) like *rk* (*rk-k*). And the very great majority (one hundred and fifty-four) of the groups of three consonants occurring in the *Sanhita* have a semivowel as their final member; with final sibilant there are only seven.

If, on the other hand, double groups are extended to triplets by appending a mute, either non-nasal or nasal (which happens in thirty-one cases), the point of division is, by the operation of the present rule, shifted toward the end of the group. Thus, we have

1. *ñ-k*, but *ñk-t*, two groups; and *ñ-ch*, but *ñj-jñ*, two groups;
2. *rk-k*, but *rkk-c*, five groups; and *rjj-j*, but *rjj-jm*, five groups;
3. *dd-gh*, but *ddgh-ghn*, two groups;
4. *sst-t*, but *sstt-tn*, two groups;

which are extensions of the groups of two members already treated of, and advance the division only one point. But further, groups ending in a sibilant, and falling under rule 9, below, and those which by rule 15 have *svarabhakti*, exhibit, when a mute is added, a still greater transference forward of the point of division, and we have

5. *k-khs* (*ks*), but *kkhst-t* (*kst*), four groups; and *k-khsh* (*ksh*), but *kkhshp-pm* (*kshpn*), five groups; and, finally,
6. *r-sh* (*rsh*), but *rshsht-t* (*rshbt*); and *r-g*, but *rggp-pm* (*rgm*), three groups.

In the yet further extension to groups of four members, the same principles prevail. There are found nineteen such groups in which the additional letter, being a semivowel, has no effect upon the division; and only three in which the division is altered by an added mute. These last are: *ñkhshst-ññ* (*ñkshn*), from *ñkhsh*; *ñkhshslt-ññ* (*ñkshln*), from *ñ-khsh* (*ñksh*); and *ñthst-t* (*nts*), from *ñ-ths* (*nts*).

Finally, the only two groups of five consonants occurring in the

*tatra niçediyakatvena<sup>19</sup> samyogādi<sup>20</sup>* (xxi.4) *sātram upatish-*  
*thathe.<sup>21</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> O. om., with the rule; W. puts, with the rule, at the end of the comment, having here also *pūrvavārāhgam bhavati*. <sup>2</sup> B. *svar-*; W. adds *svareṇa*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *'sáñh-* (as also in the rule). <sup>4</sup> W. ins. *ca*; G. M. ins. *yad*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *tat*. <sup>6</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> W. *-dab-*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. ins. *ca*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *'sáñh-*. <sup>11</sup> O. *-tva*. <sup>12</sup> O. *-ñh*. <sup>13</sup> W. B. om. <sup>14</sup> O. *-tva*. <sup>15</sup> O. *-tih*. <sup>16</sup> W. B. *anyadbā-*. <sup>17</sup> O. *cáryam*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *-ha syit*. <sup>19</sup> W. *niyatatu-*; B. *niçayatv-*. <sup>20</sup> G. M. *-di ti*. <sup>21</sup> O. *iva ti-*.

*Anusvâra* appears here once more with the distinct value of a consonantal element following the vowel—and yet not as a full consonant, else it would fall under rule 4 above, and would require no separate treatment. The treatise is not so explicit as were to be desired in defining what is to be done with it in syllabication; but I presume we may infer that it does not count as *sanyoyâdî* at all, but only as if an affection of the preceding vowel; and hence, that all the groups which it introduces are to be divided as if it were not there; that *ñge*, for example, is to be made into *ñggc-e*, *ñsm* into *ñsp-pm*, and *ñstr* into *ñsst-tr*. The example given by the commentator is *añgumâ te* (i.2.6); but it is an ill-chosen one, and quite worthless, as, in any view of the nature and treatment of *anusvâra*, no question could arise as to the division *añ-gumâ*.

For *svarabhakti*, see the concluding rules of this chapter (xxi. 15,16). The example given is *gârhupatyâh* (i.6.7<sup>1</sup> et al.), which we are to read and divide *gâr-hu-pat-tyâh*.

### नातस्थापरमसवर्णम् ॥७॥

7. But not a consonant that is followed by a semivowel, if dissimilar with it.

The negative here signifies a direct reversal of the implication, as it denotes a denial of adjunction to the preceding vowel, and hence necessarily involves adjunction to the one that follows, since the consonant cannot stand by itself. “Dissimilar” is simply explained by *vilukshânu*, ‘of diverse characteristics, different;’ it excludes from the operation of the rule the doubled semivowel itself, and would also exclude the nasal semivowel into which *n* and *m* are converted before *l*, and *m* before *y* and *v* (v.26,28), if these occurred where the rule could apply, which is not the case.

The examples quoted by the commentator are *adhyavusâiyu-diguh* (vi.1.5<sup>1</sup>; i. e. *ul-dhya-*), *madhumicrena* (v.2.8<sup>6</sup> et al.; i. e. *mig-cre-*), *uglopanayî* (vi.1.6<sup>7</sup>; i. e. *ug-glo-*), and *ishe tvâ* (i.1.1 et al.; i. e. *i-shet-tvâ*): they are not to be commended as at all fully illustrating the wide range of application of the rule. This has been sufficiently set forth above, under rule 5. It helps to determine the division of one-third of the groups of two consonants, of four-fifths of those of three, of six-sevenths of those of four, and of all those of five—or of four-sevenths of the whole number of consonant

---

7. *nakârah pârcuscaridângutrvyâvartukuh: antasthâparam vyañjanam tasyd antasthâyâl usuvaryam vilakshayam pitrvasvârâgyam na bhavati: urthit parasravarâgyam tûd iti ceditavyom:* “*svata sthânam ugakyatnât*.” *yathâ<sup>3</sup>: adhy----: madh----: ug----: ishe----: antasthâ parâ yasmât tûd antasthâparan. asuvaryam iti kîm: pari----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *iti vijñeyam*; O. om. <sup>2</sup> O. puts at end of comment on preceding rule; *B. svaryam vîna sthî*. <sup>3</sup> O. om.

included too much. The meaning is clear: that a spirant which itself belongs to the following syllable, as being either directly combined with the vowel of the latter (xxi.5) or followed only by a semivowel before that vowel (xxi.7), carries with it a preceding mute; but if, on the other hand, it be cut off from the succeeding vowel by a mute, so as itself to belong to the antecedent syllable, a mute before it goes, of course, to the same syllable. The examples given in the comment are this time well selected, and illustrate the three cases involved: they are *shat̄ sam padyunte* (v.4. 3<sup>4</sup> et al.) and *vashatt̄ svdhā* (vii.3.12); in both of them a *t* is inserted, by rule v.33, between the *t* and *s*, and the final, reading and division is *tt-ths* and *tt-thsv*. As counter-example we have *akshnaya vyāghārayati* (v.2.7<sup>5</sup> et al.), where, after all rules are satisfied, we have *kkhsht̄-tn̄*.

As compared with those to which rule 7 applies, the consonant groups falling under this rule are few, only forty-six in all; in thirty of which the spirant carries the mute before it to the following vowel, while in the remaining sixteen both go together to the one that precedes. The detail is as follows.

Of double groups, composed of a single mute and spirant, there are seven: for example, *k-khsh* (*ksh*).

Of groups containing three consonants, the largest class is that formed by the addition of a semivowel to the preceding: for example, *k-khshy* (*kshy*): it contains ten groups. Then there are two like *n-khsh* (*nksh*), three like *tt-khsh* (*tksh*), and the isolated *rk-khs* (*rks*).

Of groups of four consonants there are seven on this side, all but one (*rtt-ths=rtts*) like those of three, but with an added semivowel, which does not (xxi.7) change the division.

On the other side, where the spirant goes back to the vowel of the antecedent syllable, there are, of course, no groups of two consonants. Of groups of three we have nine, four with following non-nasal mute (as *kkhst̄-t=kst̄*), and five with following nasal (as *kkhst̄-tn̄=kshn̄*). Of groups of four, there are two (as *tthst̄-tr=tstr*) formed from the foregoing with added semivowel, and three from triplets ending in a sibilant increased by a mute, either non-nasal (namely *nthst̄-t=ntst̄*) or nasal (as *uikhst̄-tn̄=ukshn̄*). The two groups of five consonants, which also belong here, have been given above, under rule 7.

This finishes the subject of the division of consonant-groups in syllabication, the special elaborateness and intricacy of whose treat-

9. pūrvaç cukāro nāsikyā (xxi.8) ity anena samuccayavādecu-  
kah: uttaras tu' parusvārāñgrūtvākarshakuḥ: āśmapara sparcu-  
ca parasvārāñgam bhāvoti: asāv<sup>2</sup> īshmā<sup>3</sup> paraç eet<sup>4</sup> parusvārāñ-  
gum<sup>5</sup> eed ity arthaḥ. shat̄----: vashat̄---- āśmaparaç eed  
iti kim: aksh----- īshmā paro yasmād asāv īshmaparah.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. cukāro 'pi. <sup>2</sup> B asā. <sup>3</sup> MSS. -ma. <sup>4</sup> W. cen na; O. cen : sha. <sup>5</sup> W. B. -gue; O. -ga.

of writing the accent might not have been without influence on the theory as to its character—that is to say, that the Vedic phonetists may have come by an afterthought to declare the *pracaya* syllables of acute tone, and to pronounce them so, because they agreed with the acute in being without a sign of accent, while originally no such correspondence in character was perceived or intended to be signified. The conjecture will doubtless have appeared to many somewhat wild, but I think that in studying the development of the Hindu theory respecting accent it at any rate deserves to be taken fully into account and, carefully considered. I am far from regarding it at present as anything more than a conjecture; yet one or two matters have come to light since it was put forth which at least add to its plausibility. Haug, namely, in a valuable and interesting communication from India to the Journal of the German Oriental Society (vol. xvii., 1863, p. 799 ff.), shows that the modern Hindu reciters of the *Veda* give tonic distinction only to the syllables that have the accent-signs, the *svarita* and *anudātta*, so that the *udātta* appears to be no accent at all, and is entirely confounded with the toneless *pracaya*—thus, under the influence of the mode of written designation, turning topsy-turvy, as it were, the whole system of spoken accent. And again, the peculiar system of writing the accent practised in the *Qatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (which uses only one sign, the horizontal stroke beneath the syllable, applied in all the other known systems to mark the *anuddātta* tone), has been turned in later times into a peculiar system of accenting, and treatises have been written to explain and teach it as such (see Kielhorn and Weber, in Weber's *Indische Studien*, x. 397 ff.\*).

The commentator points out that two grave syllables, or even one, following the circumflex, receive the character of *pracaya* (of course, with the restriction made in the next rule), and not more than two only, as is literally signified by the plural *anuddāttānām* in the rule. To show that the conversion into *pracaya* is limited to grave syllables, he quotes *agnaye prāvate* (ii.4.1<sup>2</sup> et al.); to show that the conversion is made only in *sainhitā*, he gives part of the other passage in *pada*-form, namely *agne : dudhra : gahya : kiñcila : vanya* (O. adds *yā*). We might naturally infer from this that the *pracaya* accent does not occur at all in *pada*-text; but the inference is not a necessary one (since the rule only says that syllables which are *anudātta* in their *pada*-form become *pracaya* in *sainhitā*, without implying that there may not be *pracayas* in *pada*-text which remain such in *sainhitā*), and would doubtless be erroneous; for at least the extant *pada*-text of the Tāittirīya-Sanhita agrees in this respect with those of the other Vedas, and writes *girvānase*, *antārikṣham*, and *samāyuchante*, for example,

\* It ought to be added, that Haug and Kielhorn do not look at the matter in the same light in which I have placed it, but incline to believe in the reality and antiquity of what I have called the modern and artificially substituted systems: this is no place to discuss the subject; but I feel confident that the view I have taken will prove the only one tenable.

grave following a *pracaya*, as well as to one that comes immediately after a circumflex.

## स्पर्शादनुत्तमाङ्गतमपरादानुपूर्वान्नासिक्या: ॥ १२ ॥

12. After a non-nasal mute, when it is followed by a nasal, are inserted, in their order, nose-sounds.

Which nose-sounds, as we are told in the next rule, some call *yamas*; and by this familiar name, which the other Prātiçākhyas apply to them directly, we shall here, as we have done elsewhere, know them. The treatise teaches us nothing more about them, except (ii.49–51) that their place of production is either the nose or the mouth and nose, and that the producing organ is as in the series of mutes; and farther (xxi.8), that in syllabication they are to be reckoned with the following vowel.

The theory of these curious and equivocal constituents of the ancient Hindu alphabet I have discussed pretty fully in the note to Ath. Pr. i.99, and I have no new light to throw upon the subject here. They are transition-sounds, assumed to intervene between non-nasal and following nasal, as a kind of nasal counterpart to the non-nasal, and therefore called its *yama* or ‘twin.’

The meaning of *anupūrvyād*, ‘in their order,’ is ambiguous, as it might be understood to refer to the order either of the twenty non-nasal mutes or of the five nasals; or, of the four kinds of non-nasal mutes in each series—in which last sense the comment understands it, declaring that the first *yama* follows a first mute, the second a second, and so on; and he has before (under i.1) reckoned the *yamas* as four in the catalogue of alphabetic sounds. I have pointed out under ii.51 how difficult it is to reconcile this view with that of a variation of their organ of production as in the five series of mutes.

The commentator’s examples are *tam prathnathā* (i.4.9), *vimathnāndh* (iii.5.4<sup>3</sup>), *vidmā te agne* (iv.2.2<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *agne*), and *dārāni dadhmasi* (iv.1.10<sup>1</sup>)—one, namely, for each of the four classes of mutes. As rule xiv.24 expressly enjoins duplication of the non-nasal mute in these combinations, we are to read and divide *prathnathā*, *vidd-dma*, and so on. The counter-examples (of which all but the last are lost in W.) are as follows: to show that the insertion is made only after a mute, *kalmashī bhavati* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>: O. substitutes *brahmavādinah*, i.7.1<sup>4</sup> etd<sup>i</sup>); that this mute must be a

12. *uttamapardād anuttamād sparçād*<sup>1</sup> *anupūrvyād yuthākramām nāsikyā āgamā bhuvāti: prathnaspargāt pruthamanāsikyah:* *dvitīyād*<sup>2</sup> *dvitīyah:* *evam* <sup>3</sup>*anyatrā 'pi.*<sup>4</sup> *yathā:* *tam* *.....: vim.....: vidmā.....: dār.....: ityādi. sparçād iti*  
*kim: 'kalm..... anuttamād iti kim: sumn..... uttamapa*  
*rād iti kim.'* *sabdh.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *parata*; O. ins. *parah*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. -*kyāh*. <sup>3</sup> O. -*yasparṣyād*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*yāh*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *anye*. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> W. om.

not understand); and the sense is, that a nose-sound is imposed upon the *h* itself, or that the latter becomes nasal. It is not difficult to see on what this theory of the quality of a *h* preceding a nasal is founded—namely, a recognition of the fact that such a *h* is really an expiration of breath through the nose: it being not less true of *h* before a semivowel or nasal than before a vowel, that it is (borrowing the phraseology of an earlier rule, ii.47) *udaya-rurnādisasthāna*, ‘produced in the position of the succeeding letter.’ The commentator’s exposition might have come from the “some authorities” to whom the doctrine of that rule is attributed.

The examples given are *ahnām̄ ketuh* (ii.4.14<sup>1</sup>), *aparūpne* (ii.1.2<sup>5</sup>), and *brahmavādinah* (i.7.1<sup>4</sup> et al.). Giving to the rule its real meaning, and applying the principle laid down at xxi.8 for the syllabic division, we should read *ahh-nām̄*: and so with the rest. As was suggested under Ath. Pr. i.100, it is probably this separation of the *h* from the nasal in syllabication that has led to the division of the two in point of utterance, and then to the thrusting in between them of a transition-sound.

G. M. have adapted the reading of the rule to the new interpretation, and give *hakāran naṇu maparun násikyan* (the writing of *n* instead of *m* before *n* is frequent with these MSS.).

## रेफोष्मसंयोगे रेफस्वरभक्तिः ॥ १५ ॥

15. In the combination of *r* and a spirant, there is a *svara-bhakti* of *r*.

The doctrine of our *Prātiçākhya* respecting the *svara-bhakti* is less detailed, and less distinctly expressed, than that of the other treatises (for which, see the note to Ath. Prāt. i.101–2); from the statement here made, we should not even understand that this “vowel-fragment” is to be an insertion between the *r* and the spirant, although that is doubtless intended to be signified. The commentator enters into a long exposition of the subject; by no means, however, limiting himself to explaining and illustrating his text. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G. M.) are in some parts of this exposition fuller than the rest, and will be followed

15. <sup>1</sup>*rephasyu co "shmanaq cu sañyoge sati" rephasvarabhaktir iti jānyat: "svarasya bhak̄ iṣh svarabhuktih": yo 'syā rephasya samānasvaras<sup>8</sup> tadbhuktih syāt: rk̄drāq cā 'syā jihvāgrukarāpana-tvena<sup>4</sup> rācruṭyā<sup>5</sup> ca<sup>6</sup> samānadharmaḥ: "bhaktir avayava ekadeśa iti yāvat": etad uktam bharati: rk̄drāvayavo<sup>9</sup> bhavati 'ty arthaḥ. sūtrenā<sup>7</sup> 'nenu svarabhaktir eva<sup>8</sup> vihitā: svarabhaktisvardpaṁ tu<sup>10</sup> vispashtai<sup>11</sup> vyācashte vararuciḥ: <sup>12</sup>rk̄draddir anumātrā<sup>13</sup> repho 'rdhamātrā madhye geshā<sup>14</sup> svarabhaktir iii<sup>15</sup>. asyā 'yam arthaḥ<sup>16</sup>:*

*indriyavishayo<sup>16</sup> yo<sup>17</sup> 'sīv anur ity ucyate budhāḥ: caturbhir<sup>18</sup> unubhir mātrāpurimātām<sup>19</sup> iti smṛtam. <sup>20</sup>*

So much by way of (would-be) explanation of the rule. But the commentator goes on to say that the Çikshâ teaches other *svarabhakti*'s, to the number of five: namely, the *karenu*, between *r* and *h*, as in *barhih* (i.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.); the *karvinî*, between *l* and *h*, as in *malhâh* (ii.1.2<sup>4</sup>); the *hariñi*, between *r* and *c* or *s*, as in *dargapûrnâmásâu* (ii.2.5<sup>4</sup> et al.) and *barsam* (ii.5.7<sup>1</sup>); the *háritâ* (or *haritâ*), between *l* and *g*, as in *sahasravalçâh* (vi.3.3<sup>3</sup>); and the *hañsapuddâ* (or *hañsapddâ*), between *r* and *sh*, as in *varshâhvâm* (ii.4.10<sup>3</sup>)—and he who wants to go to heaven (on the score, no doubt, of patience, faith, and punctiliousness) must utter the five kinds of *bhakti*, as thus laid down. It appears, then, that the commentator's Çikshâ, like the Vâj. Pr. (iv.16), regards *l*, not less than *r*, as followed by *svarabhakti* before a spirant.

## न क्रमे प्रथमपरे प्रथमपरे ॥ १६ ॥

16. But not in case of *krama*, when a first mute follows the spirant.

The commentator defines *krama* as the equivalent of *dvitvâ*, 'duplication,' and refers as authority to rule xxiv.5, where the word occurs again without, according to him, admitting any other meaning; whence, he infers, it must signify the same thing here also. We should rather turn the argument the other way, and say that, as *krama* can have no other meaning here, it may be conjectured to signify the same thing at xxiv.5. He further coolly

"yâ tu hañsapadâ nâma sâ tu" rephashakdrayoh:

"evam pañcavîdhâm bhaktim uccaret svargakâmukah."

(1) G. M. *rephashâmanos sayyoge sati tatra ûshmasayyukto*. (2) G. M. *svarabhaktir iti kim : idrci svarasya bhakti svarabhaktih bhakti rôgah*: avayava iti ekadeva iti yâvat; B. O. om. *svarabhaktih*. (3) G. M. O. -naka-spañs. (4) O. -nena. (5) G. M. -gruyâ. (6) W. *yana*. (7) G. M. om.; O. -ga ity arthah. (8) W. O. rkâra eva yu-; G. M. rkârasya 'vay-. (9) G. M. evam. (10) R. om. (11) O. spa-. (12) G. M. *svaras tâvat kîñvîcîshî iti cet shodâgâ "ditah svarâh* (15) *iti svarasamîgnoktañ teshu rkârarephayos samânâsthânakaranatvâd rkâra-varasyai 'va bhaktih rkâras tâvat kîñvîcîta iti cet rkâralakarâu hr-svâu* (13) *iti hrsavatvâd ekamâtro bhaved dhrasva iti ekamâtrâkârâ vararucinâ' vam uktamâtrâkasya rkârasya "deu svarasya 'numâtrah rephasya", dhamâtro madhye 'nta svarasya 'numâtri' iti : anumâtra iti kim.* (13) B. -tratâm api. (14) O. -esha. (15) B. om.; O. anumâtre. (16) W. nish-; G. M. -driyô. (17) B. O. om. (18) W. O. -tur. (19) W. matrâprayenam; B. -trâpramânam; G. M. -na. (20) G. M. in. asyâ 'yam arthah. (21) B. G. M. -tra. (22) G. M. -trah. (23) G. M. ante. (24) W. -trah; G. M. -tra. (25) G. M. ins. rkâramâdhyava-tini. (26) G. M. vibh. (27) O. om. (28) G. M. -rd. (29) W. B. O. -sañh-. (30) W. B. *bhajyate*; G. M. O. *bhafate*. (31) G. M. *tato dve svarabhakti vidye ardhamañtrâkasvarabhaktih kutra va tishthati*. (32) W. atrâ. (33) W. om.; B. kâ. (34) G. M. ins. evam. (35) W. B. -yd. (36) W. B. -yd. (37) B. O. ca. (38) W. -id. (39) W. -id. (40) O. om. (41) G. M. sûtreno 'kti-kramena syât svarabhaktih. (42) G. M. O. ins. -pi. (43) O. om. (44) G. M. har-. (45) G. M. -pdde. (46) G. M. ins. kidrçya eti iti et. (47) W. B. -nu; G. M. -nuñ. (48) B. hayor; G. M. harayor. (49) W. B. G. M. -vidylât. (50) W. B. *raçayor yoge*; G. çasurâbhi jñeyâ; M. çasâm jñeyâ. (51) G. M. har-. (52) G. M. *svarabhaktiñ hañsapâdâm vidyâdâ*. (53) O. om.; G. M. -mukha iti : yathâ : karenuh: barhih: yathâ karvini: malhâh: harini: dargapûrnâmásâu: barsam: haritâ: sahasravalçâh: hañsapddâ: varshâhvâm ityâdi.

**शब्दः प्रकृतिः सर्ववर्णानाम् ॥१॥**

1. Tone is the material of all articulate sounds.

The putting-together, as well as the material, of this and the following chapter is rather peculiar, and makes the impression of a supplement to the Prâtiçâkhyâ proper. This present rule and its successor are akin with the first two of the next chapter, and all these with the rules of the second chapter. As under ii.1, the commentator explains *cabda* by *dhvani*; for *prakrti* he gives as synonym *mâlakârana*, ‘radical cause;’ and *varṇa* he declares to designate the whole congeries of vowels and consonants.:

**तस्य त्रूपान्यते वर्णान्यतम् ॥२॥**

2. In the difference of form of the former consists the difference of the latter.

That is to say, in the difference resulting from the variety of positions giving audible quality: compare ii.3.

**तत्र शब्दद्रव्याण्युदाकृतिभासः ॥३॥**

3. Here we will instance the offices of terms.

A complete and violent change of subject is introduced by this rule, continuing to rule 9; which last, again, attaches itself closely enough to the beginning of the chapter to have been its natural continuation. The intervening batch of rules looks like an interpolation, thrust in at this point *apropos* of *cabda* in rule 1; the word being taken here, however, in an entirely different sense. The commentator tries to smooth over the transition by pronouncing *cabda* a synonym of *cdstra*, ‘text-book, body of doctrine;’ which latter is formed by the putting to use of combinations of the alphabetic sounds just above spoken of. He distinctly ascribes to *dravya* the sense of ‘office, aim,’ as the connection also requires,

1. *sarvavarnândin<sup>1</sup> cabdo<sup>2</sup> dhvanih prakrtir mâlakâranaṁ bhavati: varṇaçabdena svaravyañjanâtmako râgir ucyate. sarve ca te varṇâc ca sarvavarnâḥ: teshâm<sup>4</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. nâma. <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. add *sarvavarnânam*.

2. *prâticrutkasthânubhedat<sup>1</sup> tasya<sup>2</sup> prakrtibhûtasya<sup>3</sup> rûpân- yatve sati varṇânyatvam syât<sup>4</sup>. yathâ: a: i: u: ityâdi.*

<sup>1</sup> B. prat; G. M. -nâd bhe. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. cabdasya. <sup>3</sup> W. pratibh-. <sup>4</sup> O. om.

3. *teshânin varṇânâni sarvatra<sup>1</sup> sainghâtaprayoge<sup>2</sup> câstram<sup>3</sup> ity<sup>4</sup> ucyate: <sup>5</sup> tasya cabda<sup>6</sup> iti paryâyanâma: tatra tasmin châstre yâni dravyâni bhavanti tâny udâharishyâmuh. yat karma yena kriyate<sup>8</sup> tat<sup>9</sup> tasya<sup>10</sup> dravyam<sup>10</sup> sâdhanam iti yâvat<sup>11</sup>: yathâ gha-*

tendency to put into them (especially into *tu*) a meaning which they were never intended to bear.

### वेति वैभाषिकः ॥७॥

7. *Vā* is alternative.

Rule ii.50 is quoted as example.

### नेति प्रतिषेधकः ॥८॥

8. *Na* is prohibitive.

The example this time is xiii.15 (G. M. substituting xiv.14); and in it appear again some of the differences of reading which were noted in the rule itself where it occurred.

**आयामो दारुण्यमणुना खस्येत्युच्चैःकराणि शब्दस्य ॥९॥**

9. Tension, hardness, smallness of aperture, are producers of high tone.

Reference is made to rule i.38, in which the acute accent is defined as consisting in high tone; and the present precept is declared to be given for the sake of that, and in order to prohibit that slack or indifferent utterance which prevails in common life. *Āyāma*, ‘tension,’ is explained as meaning rather ‘extension (literally ‘longness’) of the members;’ *dārunya*, as ‘severity of the vowel;’ and *aputū khasya*, as ‘closure of the orifice of the throat;’ this is what one who would utter a sound in high tone must do.

There is evidently much more guess-work than true observation in this rule and the one next following: if they had been given as definitions of sonant and surd utterance, instead of high and low

---

*nivrttiḥ: yatrā 'thaçabdās tatrā 'dhikārah: yatrāi 'vaçabdās tatrā 'vadhāraṇām<sup>1</sup> veditavyam. yathā: ephas tu rusya* (i.19):  
*\*atha sañhitāyām ekaprānabhāve<sup>2</sup>* (v.1):<sup>3</sup> *sparṣa<sup>4</sup> ev di' keshām acāryāṇām* (xiv.3). *vīçeshena nivartuyatī 'ti vinvartakah: adhikarotī 'ty adhikārakah<sup>5</sup>: avadhārayati 'ty avadhārakah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -māṁ. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. ins. ce 'ti. <sup>3</sup> G. M. atha nakāro naṅkāram (vii. 1). <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -apara. <sup>6</sup> W. O. G. M. -rah.

7. *ve 'ty esha çabdo vāibhāshiko<sup>1</sup> vāikalpiko bhavati. yathā: mukhanāsikyā vā* (ii.50).

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -shako (as also in the rule).

8. *ne 'ty esha gabdā pratishedhako bhavati<sup>2</sup>: yathā: 'na shumno gnir* (xiii.15) *iti.<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. syāt. <sup>2</sup> G. M. atha na (xiv.14): B. na sushu-; O. -na sum-; W. B. -gni 'ti.

these positions or qualities?" the subject is continued in the next rule.

## तत्रैकविश्शतिर्यमा: ॥ १२॥

12. In them are twenty-one tones.

For the application of these tones or keys, also, we are referred to a later passage (xxiii.11 etc.). As synonym of *yama* is given *svara*, 'tone.'

The commentator chooses to connect these rules with those that follow in the next chapter, and to overlook the obvious fact that in the two chapters we have separate and independent statements upon the same subject, which cannot have come from the same hand, and of which the second renders the first wholly superfluous.

ऋग्विरामः पदविरामो विवृत्तिविरामः समानपदवि-  
वृत्तिविरामस्त्रिमात्रो द्विमात्रे एकमात्रो अर्धमात्रे इत्या-  
नुपूर्व्येण ॥ १३ ॥

13. The verse-pause, *pada*-pause, pause for hiatus, and pause for hiatus in the interior of a word, are respectively of three *moras*, two *moras*, one *mora*, and a half-*mora*.

As example of the pause of three *moras* at the end of a verse is quoted *ubhā vñjusya sātaye huve vdm*: (i.5.5<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the first two words); of the pause of two *moras*, in *pada*-text, between the *padas*, *ishe : tvā : urje : tvā* (i.1.1 et al.): and, for all that, the Prātiçākhya tells us, we are to regard the *avagraha* pause, dividing the two parts of a compound word, as of the same length (the Rik [i.6, r. 29] and Vājasaneyi [v.1] Prātiçākhyas give it only one *mora*); of the hiatus-pause, *sa idhānah* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>), *ta enam* (ii.3.11<sup>4</sup>), and *tā asmāt* (ii.4.4<sup>1</sup>: W. prefixes *ā*, but doubtless only by

*tr̥tyam : eteshām<sup>3</sup> sthānādām prayojanam uttaratra<sup>4</sup> vakshyate.*

<sup>3</sup>*etāni sthānāni keshām ityapekshādyām dha parasūtram<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> O. 'ty etāni. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. esh. <sup>4</sup> B. ituratra. <sup>5</sup> O. om.

12. *teshu<sup>1</sup> sthāneshu ekaviñgatir yamāh svarā bhavanti: teshām yamādām uttaratra prayojanām vakshyate.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *tatra trishu*; B. adds *trishu*.

13. *rgvirāmādayas trimātrādikālā<sup>2</sup> yathākramam<sup>3</sup> bhavanti. yathā<sup>4</sup>: ubhā----: ity rgvirāmāh: ishe----: iti padavirāmāh: sa----: ta----: tā----: iti vivṛttivirāmāh: prāugam iti samānapadavirāttivirāmāh. 'rci' virāma rgvirāmāh: padasya virāmāh padavirāmāh: padadvayavivṛttā<sup>5</sup> virāmo vivṛttivirāmāh<sup>6</sup>. gikshādyām<sup>7</sup> asya viñeshu uktuh:*

The commentator instances the different kinds of “heavy” syllable, as follows: one ending with a consonant, *māte’va putram* (iv.2.3<sup>2</sup> et al.: G. M. omit); one long by its vowel, *te te’dhīpatayāḥ* (iv.4.11<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word); one followed by a consonant-group, *acmā ca me* (iv.7.5<sup>1</sup>: W.-has *ānmāyinā*, which appears to be merely a corrupt reading; I have found nothing at all like it in the Sanhitā); one that is nasal, *viñçatyāi* (vii.2.13 et al.).

The distinction of the syllable as “heavy” or “light” has value only in a metrical point of view, and does not make its appearance elsewhere in our treatise (except as it is referred to in rule xxiv.5 —which rule we might have expected the commentator to quote here, as the occasion of this one). The quality of “long” or “short” belongs to the vowel alone, and (see xxi.1 and its comment) the consonants accompanying the latter are regarded as absorbed into it, and forming part of its natural quantity. This separation of “heavy” and “long,” or of weight and quantity, is practically convenient, perhaps, but theoretically indefensible; and we have reason to be surprised that phonetic observers so acute as the Hindus had not worked the theory of syllabic quantity into a more consistent shape. The other treatises agree with this: see Ath. Pr. i.51–54, and notes.

The use of the word *anundsikā* in describing a syllable containing *anusvāra* is (as already noted, under ii.80) one more sign of a theory which regards the *anusvāra* as a quality and not an element. The Ath. Prāt., which holds this theory, uses the same term in its definition (i.59). It deserves to be noted, however, that to read *anusvāram* instead of *anunāsikam* in the verse would help the metre, making the four *pādus* similar.

This rule is enough by itself to determine the weight of any syllable whatever: but, as the commentator points out, the one following is added to resolve any doubts which might after all arise as to what syllables were light.

14. *vyañjanāntām yad aksharam: ’vyāñjanam ante<sup>2</sup> yasya tad vyañjanāntam:<sup>1</sup> yad u cā ’pi dīrgham<sup>3</sup> aksharam: <sup>4</sup> sañyoga-pūrvam ca yad aksharam: <sup>5</sup> sañyogat pūrvam<sup>6</sup> sañyogapūrvam<sup>6</sup>: tathā <sup>7</sup>nundśikam: sānundśikam<sup>8</sup> yad aksharam: uktāny etāni sarvāny aksharāṇi gurāṇi vidyat: jāñiyāt. yathā <sup>9</sup>vyañjanāntam: māte.....<sup>10</sup> yathā dīrghum: te..... yathā<sup>11</sup> sañyogapūrvam: acmā..... yathā <sup>12</sup>nundśikam<sup>10</sup>: viñçatyāi.<sup>11</sup> çeshāny ato ‘nyāni<sup>13</sup>: ata<sup>13</sup> ebhyo gurubhyah çeshāny anyāny aksharāṇi <sup>14</sup>tato ‘nanturām<sup>14</sup> laghāṇi vijāñiyāt<sup>15</sup>. çeshāni<sup>16</sup> klinīty águñkyo ‘ttaraçlokena<sup>17</sup> vivṛṇoti.*

(1) G. M. put at beginning. (2) G. M. -tām. (3) G. M. ins. yad. (4) G. M. ins. yogat pūrvam. (5) G. M. om. (6) B. G. M. om.; O. -gāñ. (7) O. om.; G. M. anu-. (8) G. M. vyañjanāntām ity atru. (9) G. M. om. (10) O. puts before yathā. (11) B. omits from here to the middle of rule 15 (beginning again with sañyogaparam). (12) G. M. O. ins. tato laghāṇi. (13) W. eta. (14) G. M. om. (15) G. M. jāñ-. (16) W. -nī ‘ti. (17) W. -ke.

It was hardly worth while to give a rule introductory to so very brief a treatment of the subject as is here to follow.

**अनुप्रदानात्सर्गात्स्थानात्करणविन्ययात् ।**

**ज्ञायते वर्णविशेषं परिमाणाच्च पञ्चमाद् इति ॥२॥**

2. The differentiation of articulate sounds arises from emission, closure, position, disposition of producing organ, and, fifthly, from quantity.

That is to say, according as any sound is different from another in respect to one or more of these five constituent or determining elements, so its nature or quality is different. The *anuprādana* is the emitted material, whether tone, breath, or the intermediate *h*-sound (ii.8-10); by *saṃsarga* (a term not elsewhere used) is doubtless intended the degree of approximation of the articulating organs, as contact (*sparsana*, ii.33), approach (*upasamhāra*, ii.81), and the like (ii.14,16,45 etc.); *sthāna*, 'place, position,' and *karana*, 'producing organ,' are the familiar names given respectively to the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth by whose contact or approach the sound receives its articulate character (*vinyaya*, which the commentator explains by *vinyasa* [B. reads this in the rule itself], seems to be added more to make up the verse than for the sake of its meaning); *parimāṇa*, 'measure' (used only here), is synonymous with *kāla*, 'time, quantity' (see i.31-37). The commentator takes *a* as an example, and says of it that its "emitted material" is tone; its "closure," in the throat; its "position," the two jaws; and its "disposition of producing organ," the two lips. Excepting in the first item, this is blundering work: *a* is, of all the alphabetic sounds, the one least easy to try by the tests laid down in this rule; and the commentator would have done well to choose some more manageable illustration.

**वर्णपृक्तः शब्दो वाच उत्पत्तिः ॥३॥**

3. Sound combined with articulation is the origin of voice.

The commentator defines *prakta* by *mīgra*, 'mixed,' and *uttpatti*

---

2. *anupradānādibhiḥ pañcabhiḥ<sup>1</sup> karaṇādir varṇavācīṣeshyam<sup>2</sup> jāyate. akārasya tāvad anupradānam nādaḥ: saṃsargah kāntē: sthānam hanū: karanavinyaya<sup>3</sup> -oshtāḥ: vinyayo nāma vinyāsah: parimāṇam<sup>4</sup> mātrākālah: evam sarvavarnānām boddhavyam. vīgeshabhāvo<sup>5</sup> vācīṣeshyam: varṇāndāni vācīṣeshyam varṇavācīṣeshyam<sup>6</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. -nāndāni v-. <sup>3</sup> O. -nyasa. <sup>4</sup> W. O. *parim-*, as also (with T.) in the rule. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. -shasya bh-. <sup>6</sup> W. O. om.; G. M. *tathā*.

3. *prakta mīgra ity arthaḥ: varṇamīgruh<sup>1</sup> ṣabdo vāco vākyasyo*

sound in this mode of utterance. “Without application of mind” excludes any intentional use of *udātta* etc. This last is not very satisfactory; and, indeed, we should as soon expect the contrary term, *manahprayoga*, ‘with application of mind,’ to be read, as indicating an utterance in which the mind does its full part, though not the voice also (G. M., in fact, read it in the rule).

### अक्षरव्यञ्जनानामनुपलब्धिर्धानः ॥३॥

7. “Murmur” is inaudibleness of syllables and consonants.

The commentator explains *akshara*, ‘syllables,’ as meaning here ‘vowels,’ but there seems no need of refusing the word its ordinary signification. Inaudibleness, we are further told, being a characteristic of *upāṅgu* also, it is here again specified in order to teach that there is no actual sound heard. Of what follows, a great part has dropped out in B. G. M., and is much corrupted in the other two manuscripts, so as to be very obscure. The separate mention of syllables and consonants is for the sake of clearness (?), and indicates exceeding inaudibleness: and there is added a comparison with tame and wild cattle, of which I fail to make any sense. Others say that the inaudibleness is of *s*, *h*, and so on. All of which is very trivial and unedifying.

### उपलब्धिर्निर्मदः ॥४॥

8. “Whisper” is their audibleness.

---

*manahprayogo yasminn<sup>4</sup> ity amanahprayogam<sup>5</sup>. vāca sthānam īdr̥cam<sup>6</sup> upāṅgu ity upadīgaye. tatra karanavād iti tāshṭrīmbhūvanivṛttyarthaṁ<sup>7</sup>: açabdām iti çabdasyā 'tyantālpatārtham<sup>8</sup>: amanahprayogam ity udāttādinām sāmkalpikaprayogapratishedhārtham<sup>9</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. put before *asmin*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -dah. <sup>3</sup> W. *manah*; B. -gah *stvam*; O. *manasah pr-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *'sminn*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -gah. <sup>6</sup> W. *sthānam* *vaca ichvām*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. -thah. <sup>8</sup> G. M. -thah. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *sāmkalpikapratī-*; B. G. M. -thah.

7. *aksharāṇi svārāḥ*: *aksharāṇām vyañjanāṇānī<sup>1</sup> cā 'nupalabdhīr dhvāno nāma dvitīyām vāca sthānam. upāṅgulakshane 'py anupalabdhāu satyām punarvacanam<sup>2</sup> açabdopalabdhividhānārtham<sup>3</sup>: 'aksharavyañjanāṇām bhedagrahanam<sup>4</sup> abhikhyārtham<sup>5</sup>: atyāntānupalabdhīr<sup>6</sup> ity arthat. <sup>7</sup> anye tv<sup>8</sup> āhuh: ' aksharavyañjunāṇām savisarjanīyādīnām<sup>10</sup> anupalabdhīr iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *svārāṇām*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. -cana; O. -canām. <sup>3</sup> W. B. O. çabd-; G. M. -rīthah. <sup>4</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> O. *bhedena gr-*. <sup>6</sup> W. ābhākshayayārtham; O. ābh-. <sup>7</sup> O. -ntāpal-. <sup>8</sup> W. ins. yāmanyasya paçor araranyasya pi tūcyam iti; O. ins. yāihā na grāmyasya paçor ante nāranyasādlyetacyam iti. <sup>9</sup> O. om. tu. <sup>10</sup> G. M. vis-.

8. *aksharavyañjunāṇām upalabdhīr nimado nāma trītyām vāca sthānam bhavati.*

like the warble of the *cakravākā*; the third soma-libation is known as accompanied with loud tone, and this is always to be employed as head-tone, with sound proceeding from the head, and resembling the cries of the peacock, *hānsa* and *kokila*."

The Rik Pr. (xiii.17) teaches the same three *sthānas*, but calls the third *uttama* instead of *tāra*. The Vāj. Pr. (i.10,80) lays down their number and their place of production (assigning to the third the *bhrūmadhya*, 'middle of the brows,' instead of *gīras*, 'head'), but gives them no specific names. We cannot well avoid regarding them as involving a difference of pitch, as well as of force or loudness of utterance; the first is low, the third high and shrill, the other intermediate between them, or at the ordinary natural pitch of the voice. They answer to the lower, middle, and upper "registers" of a voice; and our modern musical theory recognizes an analogous distinction of chest-tone and head-tone. Each register, as the following rules go on to explain, is divided into seven tones or pitches.

### मन्त्रादिषु त्रिषु स्थानेषु सप्तसप्त घमा: ॥ ११ ॥

11. In the three qualities beginning with "soft," there are seven tones each.

As synonym of *yama*, the commentator gives *svara*, doubtless here to be understood as 'musical note, tone of the gamut;' he adds 'acute, and so on,' which might be said blunderingly, as if the word he had just given meant 'accent' instead of 'musical tone,' or also intelligently, as implying the identity of accent with

---

*prātah pathen<sup>10</sup> nityam urasthitenu<sup>11</sup>*  
*svareṇa gārdūlāruto pamenā<sup>12</sup>:*  
*madhyandine kūñthagatena cdi 'va*  
*cakrāhvusaiukūjitusaiinibhena.*  
*tārain tu vidiyāt savanaia<sup>13</sup> trtiyani<sup>14</sup>*  
*cirogatam<sup>15</sup> tuc ca sadā<sup>16</sup> prayojyam:*  
*mayūrahānsānyubhṛtasvanānām*  
*tulyena nādena ciasthitena<sup>17</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. put before *vācaḥ*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *bhavati*. *kañṭhe madhya-*  
*mām*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *bhavati*. *gīrasi tāram*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *bhavati*. <sup>6</sup> B. *caturvar-*  
*nānām*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. ins. 'pay-' <sup>8</sup> W. -nam up-; G. M. -ne *urasi prayu-* <sup>9</sup> B. G. M.  
 om. <sup>10</sup> W. *ka-*; G. M. -*than*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. -*sthālena*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. -*rato*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. -*ne*.  
<sup>14</sup> G. M. -*ye*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. -*ottilātām*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *tathā*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. *cirogatena*.

11. *trishu mandrādīshu sthāreshv ekāikasmīnt saptasapta yamā*  
*bhavanti: yamāḥ 'svarādh: udāttādaya<sup>1</sup> iti yāvat. saptasapte<sup>2</sup> ti*  
*vīpsyā<sup>3</sup> ekāikasmīnn iti labhyate. ke te<sup>4</sup> yamā ity ācañkyo 'tra-*  
*rasūtreṇo<sup>5</sup> ttaram dha.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *svarādaya*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. -*yāḥ*; O. -*yām*. <sup>3</sup> W. O. *ne*; G. M. O. put before  
 ke. <sup>4</sup> W. -*bro*.

ception of *mandra* from that of *atisvārya*; that of the fourth, from *mandra*; and so on through the series. Perhaps the expression is nothing more than one violently figurative, signifying that each tone receives light from, or is set in its true light by, the rest, or the ones or one nearest it: only, in that case, we should look for some word combined with *dīpti* to indicate the source of the light.

Müller (under Rik Prāt. xiii.17, r. decli.) surmises that the present rule may mean the same thing with the rule of the Rik Prāt. *anantaraç cā 'tra yamo 'viçeshah*, which he translates ‘in these three places (*sthāna*) a *yama* without another *yama* is undistinguishable.’ It is very doubtful, however, whether he is justified in rendering *anantara* by ‘not having another,’ and whether his rule is not rather intended to signify that the three scales pass directly into one another, the first note of the second being equivalent to an eighth of the first, and so on.

### द्वितीयप्रथमकृष्टाख्य आङ्गारकस्वराः ॥ १४ ॥

14. “Second,” “first,” and *kṛṣṭa* are the three tones of the Āhvārakas.

This rule makes a *gloka* with the one that follows: which is, of course, a marked indication that both are interpolated here. The same thing may be inferred from the fact that rule 15 teaches nothing which is not found also in 16.

The comment adds nothing whatever to our understanding of the rule.

The Āhvārakas are mentioned in the Caranavyūha (paragraph 12: see Weber's Indische Studien, iii.257) as holders of one *gākha* of the Yajur-Veda.

### मन्द्रादयोँ द्वितीयातांश्वारस्त्तेतिरीयकाः ॥ १५ ॥

15. Thé four beginning with *mandra* and ending with “second” are those of the Tāittirīyas.

This second half-verse, as already pointed out, is superfluous in view of the next rule, which treats the same subject, and much more explicitly.

14. *dvitiyaç ca prathamaç ca kṛṣṭaç<sup>1</sup> ca te tatho 'ktāh<sup>2</sup> : ete traya āhvārakasvardāh<sup>3</sup> syuh : \*eshāñ<sup>4</sup> tāir eva prayogo veditavyah<sup>5</sup>. \*āhvārakāññām svardāh<sup>6</sup> āhvārakasvardāh.*

O. inserts the whole comment out of place, after that to the next rule. <sup>1</sup> G. M. *kṛush-* (as also, with T., in the rule); O. *kush-*. <sup>2</sup> B. ins. *dvitiyādayah*. <sup>3</sup> W. -*kāsu-*; O. -*kārd*. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *te-*. <sup>6</sup> B. -*kashṭāsvardāñām*; G. M. -*kasvardā*.

15. *mandrādayaç cutvārō<sup>1</sup> dvitīyāntāh svardā<sup>2</sup> mandracaturtha-trītyadvitīyās tāittirīyakāh syuh<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. -*ra svara*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> O. *teshāñ titirīyake prayogo veditavyah*.



## तामुपदेत्यामः ॥ १८ ॥

18. That progression we will set forth.

The commentator declares *tām* here to bring forward solely the word *vṛttim* from the preceding rule (not that word with its qualifications), and the *vṛttis* aimed at to be the fourfold progression of the *caturyama* taught in rules 16 and 19. This is, of course, forced and unacceptable. I imagine that, on the contrary, in the oral tradition of the Prātiçākhyā, an uttered illustration of the four tones, separated by double intervals and so covering the whole octave, was given—which illustration, of course, could not be set down in the written text.

## तचतुर्धनित्याम् ॥ १९ ॥

19. That is what is called the quaternion of tones.

This is naturally enough explainable as a winding-up remark, after the exemplification of the four Tāittirīya tones notified in the preceding rule has been duly given. To the commentator, it is a mere repetition of what had been already stated above, in rules 15 and 16; and he excuses it as being intended, under the guise of a summing-up, to confirm the view laid down, and repel other opinions inconsistent with it. For, he adds, some people hold the doctrine that there are three *svaras* only, as appears from the half-verse “acute, grave, and circumflex are the three accents.” This verse (from the *pāṇiniya Cikshā*) was quoted in full above, under rule xxi.1; and W. adds the second half of it here also.

The futility of this exposition, as well as of much that precedes it, will, I think, be obvious to any one. Instead of tracing and pointing out the relation which actually exists between the accents and the *yamas*, and letting us see what musical intervals are re-

---

18. *yad etad dcdrydiç caturyamam ity uktain tasyu caturbheda-bhinnā<sup>1</sup> vṛttir<sup>2</sup> nāma: tām upadekshyāma ity ucyate. <sup>3</sup>tām iti tachabdenā<sup>4</sup> pūrvoktavṛttimātram anukrshyate<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -ām. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -īm. <sup>3</sup> W. O. tānimittaçabd-; B. tām iti labdhena. <sup>4</sup> W. kathy-.

19. *ity anena prakāreṇa caturyamam ity<sup>1</sup> uktam. yady api mandrādayo dvitīyāntā (xxiii.15) ityādisūtradvayena yama-catushtayatvāṁ<sup>2</sup> siddham tathā 'py upasāṁhāramishena<sup>3</sup> matān-tarani-vṛttiyartham<sup>4</sup> dr̥dhayati. yataḥ kāraṇād evam anye man-yante svaratrayamātram:*

*uddāṭṭaç cā 'nudāṭṭaç ca svaritaç ca 'svardś trayah.<sup>5</sup>*

*\*hrasvo dīrghaḥ pluta iti kālato niyamā aci.<sup>6</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> W. caturyayamacatushtayam pra; B. -tayām na; O. cat. <sup>3</sup> W. -ṣṭena; G. M. -hārena mi-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. imam aritham. <sup>5</sup> B. O. -ya iti; G. M. trayasvurā iti manyante. <sup>6</sup> in W. only.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

CONTENTS: 1–4, the four *samhitâs* or texts; 5–6, qualifications of a Veda-reader and teacher.

**अथ चतुरः संश्लिताः ॥१॥**

1. Now for the four texts.

A simple heading to the following rules.

**पदसंश्लिताकारसंश्लिता वार्षसंश्लिताङ्गसंश्लिता चे-  
ति ॥२॥**

2. Word-text, syllable-text, letter-text, and member-text, namely.

Here is a very curious and problematical enumeration and designation of *samhitâs*. The commentator divides up among them the teachings of the Prâtigâkhyâ. To the “word-text” he assigns chapters v.–ix., xi., xii., and xiii.1–4—that is to say, the great body of rules for the combination of *pada*-text into *samhitâ*. To the “syllable-text” he assigns chapter x., which has to do chiefly with such euphonic combinations of vowels as make one syllable out of two. With the “letter-text” are concerned chapters xiii. (i. e. except rules 1–4), xiv., and xvi., mainly occupied with the subjects of duplication and of the occurrence in the Sanhitâ of *n* and *ñ*, otherwise than as these are results of the rules of euphonic combination. And the “member-text” is said to be taught in chapter

---

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah: catasrah samhitâ<sup>1</sup> ucyanta<sup>2</sup> ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttarâm yad vakshyâmaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> O. *-yate*.

2. *padâksharavarṇângâgrayâd<sup>1</sup> catasrah samhitâh kramena boddhavyâh. pañcamâdhyâyam<sup>2</sup> ārabhya<sup>3</sup> "navamâd ekâdaça-dvâdaça<sup>4</sup> trayodâcausyâd<sup>5</sup> "dâu sûtracatushtayâm ca padasamhitâ. daçaamo<sup>6</sup> ksharasamhitâ. trayodaçaçaturdaça<sup>7</sup> shodâcaç ca var-nasamhitâ. <sup>8</sup>vyañjanâñ svarângam (xii.1) ity eshâ<sup>9</sup> 'ñgâ-samhitâ. etâd<sup>10</sup> catasrah samhitâh. eteshv anyatra<sup>11</sup> vihitâm ni-shiddham<sup>12</sup> ca kâryam sarvasamhitâsu<sup>13</sup> kuryâd<sup>14</sup>: yatrâ<sup>15</sup> "rsha-grahañâdiko viçesho<sup>16</sup> 'sti<sup>17</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -gâ *ayâd*; O. -gâyâd. <sup>2</sup> W. B. O. ārabhya à nav-; G. M. ārabhya unapa-dâkâdâ-; W. O. -dvâdaça. <sup>3</sup> O. -sd. <sup>4</sup> W. -rdâca. <sup>5</sup> B. G. M. ekavîñpo. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> O. ins. *ca*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. nishidhyakan. <sup>9</sup> B. -tâ; G. M. sarvatra samhitâ; O. sahit-. <sup>10</sup> G. M. syât. <sup>11</sup> W. B. O. atrd. <sup>12</sup> G. M. add *tatra kuryâd*.

pendent syllables is syllable-text—and so on. And he quotes three passages from the text, by way of illustration: *athā 'bravīt* (iii.2. 11<sup>3</sup>), *adhiśhavanam asi* (i.1.5<sup>2</sup>), and *akṣṇayā vydghātārayati* (v. 2.7<sup>5</sup> et al.). Of these, the first is an example of the combination of two separate syllables (vowels) into one syllable, by a rule (2) of the tenth chapter; the second, of the occurrence of *n* after *sh*, by rule xiii.6,7; the third offers (like almost any other pair of words in the Sanhitā) cases of the division of consonant-groups, *akkhṣṭ-tṇa-ydū-vyā-* etc. Or, by a different treatment of the successive distinctions, it is said that the combination of two vowels alone is “syllable-text,” that of a vowel and consonant in one word is “letter-text,” that of consonants alone in one word (consonants being “members” or adjuncts of vowels, xxi.1) is “member-text;” anything else than these is “word-text.”

It appears from all this that *sainhītā* is here used nearly in the sense of *sāṃdhī*, ‘euphonic combination,’ and that these four rules have no significance whatever, being a mere bit of outside classification, in which some one has amused himself by indulging.

गुरुवं लघुता साम्यँ छस्वदीघ्स्तुतानि च ।  
 लोपागमविकाराश्च प्रकृतिर्विक्रमः क्रमः ॥  
 स्वरितोदात्तनीचवँ श्वासो नादो ऽङ्गमेव च ।  
 एतत्सर्वं तु विज्ञेयं हन्दोभाषामधीयता ॥५॥

5. Heaviness, lightness, evenness; short, long, and protracted quantity; elision, increment, and euphonic alteration; natural state, *vikrama*, *krama*; circumflex, acute, and grave quality; breath, tone, and adjunction—all this must be understood by him who reads the Veda language.

---

*svarūpam* *nirāpanīyam*. *nānāksharasamīyogo* 'ksharasamīhitā':  
 'nānāvaraṇasamīyogo varṇasamīhitā': *nānāgāsasamīyogo* 'ngasamī-  
 hitā'. 'krameno 'dāharanāni bhanāmāḥ': *yathā*: *athā*....:  
*adhi*....: *akṣṇ*.... *kevalasvarayoh* samīyogo 'ksharasamī-  
 hitā':<sup>3</sup> 'ekapade svaravyañjanasamīyogo varṇasamīhitā': *ekapade*  
*kevalavyañjanasamīyogo* 'ngasamīhitā':<sup>4</sup> *anyatra padasamīhitā*:  
*ity avāntarabhedo vijñeyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. *swam*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.; O. om. *eva*. <sup>3</sup> O. -*sva*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. put also after rule 4 in the text of the Prātiçākhya, as if rules 5 and 6. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> W. om.; G. M. *vyāhardamāḥ*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> E. om.

5. *yad gurutvādyushtādaçavidham etat sarvam chandobhā-  
 shām vedarūpam*<sup>1</sup> *vācam adhiyatā pañhatā vijñeyam. athā vā-  
 chandobhāshām*<sup>2</sup> *vedulakshanam*<sup>3</sup> *ity arthaḥ. tuçabdo 'dhyetṛvya-  
 tiriktañishedhārthaḥ*<sup>4</sup>: *anena*<sup>5</sup> *tu sarvathā vijñeyam* *ity arthaḥ.*

*thunī abhavan* (v.3.6<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *na*). Of these, the second is a case under x.13; the third, under x.18: both exhibiting a vowel which irregularly remains *prakṛtyā*, or exempt from alteration. But the particular bearing of the first example on the point of *prakṛti* is more obscure: the phrase is one in which the *sāṃhitā*-reading is (except in respect to accent) the same with the *pada*; and this, probably, is the reason why it is taken. Compare the comment and note to v.2, where this part of the rule now in hand is quoted. For *vikrama* is given the word *nōdhavē* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), of which the second syllable has the accent called *vikrama*, by xix. 1. *Krama* is again (as under xxiii.20) defined as ‘duplication,’ and a phrase is quoted containing a case that calls for duplicated utterance, *yad vāi hotā* (iii.2.9<sup>1</sup>: i. e. *yad dvāi*, by xiv.1): O. adds another of like character, *yad venoh* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>). We are permitted to doubt, however, heré as at xxiii.20, whether these terms were intended by the maker of the rule in the sense which the commentator assigns to them. The three accents are instanced, in their order as mentioned, by *nyāñcam* (v.5.3<sup>2</sup>), *gā̄m vā'vā tā'u tāt* (i.7.2<sup>2</sup>), and *avudatām* (i.7.2<sup>2</sup>). Reference is made to rule ii.5 as defining “breath,” and as example of breath-sounds, or surd consonants, is cited *vrishā te* (i.1.2<sup>2</sup>: B. has instead *pāte*, and W. *pārte*, which occurs at iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>). Rule ii.4, again, is referred to as defining “tone” or sonant utterance, and the example is *bhāgudhē bhāgudhāh* (ii.5.6<sup>6</sup>). Finally, *āṅgam*, which I have rendered ‘adjunction,’ is interpreted as alluding to the subject of syllabication (xix.1 etc.), and a phrase is quoted, *tan matsyah prā'bravīt* (ii.6.6<sup>1</sup>), which we are to divide *tum-nat-thsyā-p-prāb-bra-vit*.

The verses composing this rule are found in a passage prefixed to the proper text of the Rik Prāt. (see Müller's edition, p. viii.).

पद्क्रमविशेषज्ञो वर्णक्रमविचक्षणः ।  
स्वरमात्राविभागज्ञो गहेदाचार्यसञ्चासदं  
गहेदाचार्यसञ्चासदमिति ॥ ६ ॥

6. He who understands the distinctions of the *pada-krama*, who is versed in the *varṇa-krama*, and knows the divisions of accent and quantity, may go and sit with the teachers.

ukto nādo yathā: *bhāg----- vyanjanāḥ svarañgam* (xxi. 1) ity uktam anāgām yathā: *tam----- vijñeyatvam*<sup>17</sup> iti<sup>18</sup> nityavidhiḥ: *vipakshe bādhāt: mantro hīnāḥ svarato varṇato re*<sup>19</sup> 'tyādi<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*dassvar-*. <sup>2</sup> O. -*ślā*. <sup>3</sup> W. O. -*ṇuit*; G. M. -*ṇām*. <sup>4</sup> W. -*kta iti nish-* <sup>5</sup> G. M. *anenū dhyata*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sthānakātl-*. <sup>7</sup> B. O. *sthāulyam*; G. M. *tī sāmyam*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>9</sup> W. ins. *etat sarvam tu vijñeyam chañdobhāvddhāyatā*. <sup>10</sup> B. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. ins. *tud.* <sup>12</sup> in O. only. <sup>13</sup> W. *pālakr-*: O. *tail yathā*. <sup>14</sup> O. om. <sup>15</sup> MSS. -*tañā*. <sup>16</sup> W. *on*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. O. -*yaṁ*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *ita*. <sup>19</sup> O. *vī*. <sup>20</sup> W. -*dīnā*; B. -*dīnā nāma*; O. *mīthyā prayukto na tam artham īha tyādinām*.

of obtaining good things; hence, by application to the reading of the Veda one attains the highest *brahma*. To that let him who is wise especially devote himself; that let him deliver over to pupils; by application to that and communication of it what is there that one does not attain?" From Yâjñavalkya: "Above all sacrifices, and ascetic practices, and pure works, the Veda is the highest means of felicity to the twice-born ones. The Brahman who, not reading the Vedas, expends his labor in other directions—he quickly falls, while living, into the condition of a Çûdra, and his posterity with him" (the latter of these two verses, which is not given by W. B., is found in Manu, at ii.168). From the Mahâbhârata: "Whoever shall repeat to pupils the religious, sacred Sarasvatî, he shall gain a reward equal to that from the giving of land and kine." From the Vishnudharmottara-purâna: "By imparting the Veda, a man attains all the fruits of sacrifices; by imparting an *upaveda*, he shares in the bliss of the Gandharvas." From the Brahma-purâna: "That reward cannot be told in a thousand æons, which, oh sage! one obtains by even a very little teaching of the Veda." And from the Bhavishyat-purâna: "The sonless obtains sons; the poor becomes rich; but he who is ever devoted to the study of the Veda is dissolved in the highest *brahma*."

Next we are told the characteristic form of the Veda: "The Yajur-Veda is brown-eyed, slim-waisted, big-throated, big-cheeked, black-footed, dusky, born of the family of Kaçyapa." If there is (as may be the case) real meaning hidden under these apparently senseless epithets, it escapes my discovery

*tathâ ca yâjñavalkyah :*

*yajñânâm tapasâm cûlî 'va çubhânâm<sup>33</sup> cûlî 'va karmanâm :  
veda eva dvijâtinâm niçreyasakarah parah.*

<sup>34</sup>*yo 'nadhîtya<sup>35</sup> dvijo vedân anyatra kurute gramam :  
sa jîvann eva çûdratvam âgu gachati sânvayaḥ<sup>36</sup>.*

*mahâbhârate<sup>37</sup>:*

*yo brûyâc cûlî 'pi çishyebhyo<sup>37</sup> dharmyâm brâhmîm sarasvatîm :  
prthivîgoprâdânâbhyâm sa tulyaphalam açnute.*

*vishnudharmottare 'pi<sup>38</sup>:*

*vedadânâd avâpnoti sarvaiḥ yajñaphalam narah :  
upavedapradânenâ gandharvâiḥ saha modate.*

*brahmapurâne 'pi<sup>39</sup>:*

*nu tat<sup>40</sup> kalpasahasrena gaditum<sup>41</sup> çakyate phalam :  
yad vedadânâd âpnoti<sup>42</sup> svalpâd<sup>43</sup> api mahâmate.*

*bhavishyatpurâne 'pi<sup>44</sup>:*

*aputro labhate putrân adhano dhanavân bhavet :  
sadâdhyayanayuktas tu <sup>45</sup>pare brahmanî<sup>46</sup> kyate.*

*vedasvarûpam ucyate :*

*yajurvedâh piñgalâkshâh krçamadhyo břhadgalâh :  
břhatkapolah krshnâñghris<sup>46</sup> tamrah kaçyapagotrajah<sup>47</sup>.*

Sanhitā (I should guess that they would all prove to occur in the Brāhmaṇa or Āranyaka), and that the first class are offered as containing cases of combination at variance with the rules of the Prātiçākhya, while in the second class these rules are observed throughout. Thus, in the first example, vii.4 would require *nakṣ-* after *pra*; in the second, v.12 would require *im 'amāda*; in the third, the *s* of *sapta* should be *sh* by vi.2; in the fourth, the *i* of *mīthunī* should remain unchanged by x.18; in the fifth, *asmin* is not included among the words which by vi.14 have an increment of *s* before *t*. In the other class, on the contrary, *agnishtomasya* follows vi.2, *nish pra* is by viii.24 and 35 (see the comment to viii.35, where the passage is quoted as illustration), and *uṣmasī* by iii.18; the first example has nothing but cases under the general laws of euphony. I conjecture, then, that the *na* in the second line of the introductory verse is to be amended to *ca*; and that we are instructed that the rules of the treatise are followed, outside the Sanhitā proper, only according to the nature of each particular case, or even by arbitrary choice. If there is any definite system according to which the phonetic peculiarities of the Sanhitā are observed or neglected in putting together the endings of sections and other divisions, I, at any rate, have not been at the pains to study it out, and the work belongs rather to an editor of the Sanhitā than to an editor of the Prātiçākhya: it seems somewhat strange to find the prolonged *i* of *uṣmasī* retained in the ending, while the uncombinable character of the final of *mīthunī* is neglected.

There can be little question that the passage here treated is an appendage to the proper text of the Tribhāshyaratna, which, with the Prātiçākhya, takes in general (the only exception is at viii.35) no account of the subdivisions of *anuvākas*.

By way of conclusion, the remark is added that the repetition of the final words of the rule indicates the end of the treatise. This is not to be approved, for the repetition is simply that which is made at the end of every chapter, and so shows nothing more than the conclusion of the chapter.

(28) W. *yasasah ph-*; G. M. *greyasām param*; O. *greyasah param*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. O. *tato*.  
 30 G. M. *-dhyāyaniratāt*. <sup>31</sup> W. B. om. <sup>32</sup> O. *tat ki yajñā*. <sup>33</sup> O. *uccinām*. <sup>34</sup> W. B. om. <sup>35</sup> O. *nadhīva*. <sup>36</sup> G. M. O. *-te 'pi*. <sup>37</sup> G. M. *śishyāya*. <sup>38</sup> G. M. O. om.  
 39 G. M. O. om. <sup>40</sup> W. O. *tulya*. <sup>41</sup> O. *gani*. <sup>42</sup> W. B. *avāp-*. <sup>43</sup> W. O. *svātmād*.  
 44 G. M. O. om. <sup>45</sup> O. *parabrahmanī*. <sup>46</sup> W. -*pādhrīh*; O. *-shtāndāndhi*. <sup>47</sup> G. M. *kāṣ-*. <sup>48</sup> W. *-dānsi*. <sup>49</sup> W. *-dhāih*. <sup>50</sup> O. *prad-*. <sup>51</sup> G. M. *nā*. <sup>52</sup> W. B. O. *-rkāṣ-*.  
 53 W. *-dhāih*. <sup>54</sup> B. *sāṅgopāṅgavedasvalakṣhanam*, and put below, after *-varāṇe*; G. M. O. substitute *evaṁ sāṅgopāṅgam vedaṁ qotrasvarūpādiyāñānena* (G. M. *-di  
vijānann*) *adhiyānah pūto bhanuti*. [yadrchayā :  
granthāntare yaihāttatvam (O. *yathā tadvat*) idam castram (G. M. ins. *yathāvidhi*)  
asūtriteshu (O. *sūcakeshu*) sthāneshu pāurusheshu na (O. om.) vartate.

*tathā hi : pra--- : sa--- : mahi--- : apि--- : asmin s--- : ityādā na* (O. om. *na*) vartate (G. *prav*): *siñhe--- : dvād--- : atm--- : uṣmasī--- : ityādā tu vartate. gached acāryasamsadām iti vipsā cāstrasamāptim* (O. *-trapari-  
sam*) *dyotayati*. <sup>55</sup> B. *-niçatimo*; G. M. O. *dvitiyaprañe dvādaço*.

mint sahasraçākhe, ūrdhve caste pratisñhite, brahmaśame pratisñhite, agnidhṛte, and prathamaje; under iv.12, paçucrapani (or bhasmaçrapani); under iv.15, tam (or tām) dhūri hvayante (or vācuyati), hūti punar (or manur) juhoti, and hūti tasmād vivāh (or evāh); under iv.37, īndrāgnī havāmahe; under vi.5, pramatis te devānām; under xi.3, as beginning of an anuvāka, dhātā devebhyo 'surān; under xi.16, gayasphūno 'gnishu. All this, in my view, is false and arbitrary interpretation; the Prātiçākhya is less careful to limit itself to the *minimum citabile* than the commentator would fain have it, and it quotes, for example, the whole word *vicākhe* instead of -*gākhe* alone, simply because *gākhe* occurs as *pragraha* only in that word.\* The same implication is appealed to by the commentator under xi.9, 15, xii.3, xvi.12 (though without actual citation of phrases), to explain away what would otherwise be inaccuracies in the Prātiçākhya; *nalam plavam* is given under xiii.16, in the course of the unjustifiable exposition of that rule; and *brahmāsn*, though found in the Sanhitā, is credited under xv.8 to another *gākha*. I do not regard anything in this whole class of cases as authorizing us to suppose that the Prātiçākhya had in view a text including anything not found in the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā.

Next, as to citations made in the commentary as if from the text to which the Prātiçākhya relates, but not found in the Sanhitā. And here I have first to report a few phrases which are among those occurring only in the manuscripts that came last to my hands, and which escaped my notice when preparing for my last search through the Sanhitā, so that I have not looked for them (not having had the courage to undertake the long and tedious quest through the Sanhitā a fourth time for so little). They are *achāvākah* (xiv.5), *uccā ratnam ayajanta* (ii.49), *tasmād varāpam* (xx.3), *dārgyañ hi* (xxi.16), *naq cid ati* (xiv.10), *prāgnāti* (xiv.9), and *brhaspati sūrapate* (xiv.10). Respecting several of these, it is doubtful whether they are not mere corruptions of phrases actually found and referred. Then there is *kavīcastah* (xvi.2), instead of which, by an error, I sought and found *kavīcastāh*. There remain, cf quotations hunted for but not discovered, the following: *adya vasu vasatī 'tī 'ndram eva* (x.10: O. only), *anv enām mātā* (xx.1: Weber refers me for this to Cānkh. vi.17.2 [?]; Ācval. iii.3; also Ait. Brāh. ii.6), *ahorātre pārṣve* (viii.7: only W. and [?] O.: found in Tāitt. Ar. iii.18.2), *utu gravasā pṛthivīmitrasya* (v.12: only G. M.), *upārchaty askandāya* (x.9: only G. M.), *caturhotā* (ii.25: Tāitt. Br. ii.2.3<sup>2</sup>), *brahmāduḍanam pacati* (x.7: Tāitt. Br. i.1.9<sup>3</sup>), *yaq chandasām* (xiv.10: O. only), *yā prāci dīk* (iv.33: W. B. O.), *varshābhyah* (xiv.16: but I am not certain that I did not satisfy myself with *varshyābhyah* and omit to search for this), *varsheybhiḥ* (xiv.16: O. only, and it reads *varshebhiḥ*),

\* The quotation of *dhātā rātih* (xi.3), to be sure, is more out of the way, and only to be explained as irregularly pleonastic, like that of *iyam eva sā yā* (xi.3), into which the commentator, with equal arbitrariness, tries to interpret a very different meaning.

I would repeat here, what I have already said, that my testing of the precise adaptation of the Prātiçākhya to the Sanhitā is not absolute, since I possess neither an *index verborum* to the latter nor a *pada*-manuscript, and my results will probably admit of rectification in some points—but I trust not to any such extent as should invalidate the general conclusion.

This conclusion is, that the Prātiçākhya probably contemplates the same text, neither more nor less, as that which constitutes the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā, the only *gākhā* left us (unless the Kāthaka be regarded as another) of the many which formerly represented the Black Yajur-Veda. The name Tāittirīya-Prātiçākhya, then, is both a convenient and a suitable one to be applied to the treatise.

If, however, this name be understood as implying that the text-book emanates directly from the Tāittirīya school, its propriety is much more questionable. Besides the numerous teachers and “holders of *gākhās*” referred to in the rules, whose names in some cases are related with those of traditional schools of the Black Yajus (see Weber's notes to the Caranavyūha, in his Indische Studien, iii.256 ff.), three schools are mentioned by name, those of the Mīmānsakas (v.41), Āhvārakas (xxiii.14), and Tāittirīyas (xxiii.15, 16). Now we do not expect the text-book of a school to name that school; its rules are those which apply “here,” “with us,” and only outsiders need specification; besides, the Tāittirīyas are represented as holding a doctrine which is not that of the treatise itself, although it is deemed of consequence enough to be set forth with a detail elsewhere unknown. We are far from fully comprehending as yet the origin, nature, and relations of the “schools” of Vedic study and their accepted texts or *gākhās*, or the causes which have preserved to us so few of the latter, and of the school-treatises or *prātiçākhyas*; but we must of course assume that there were various degrees of difference among the *gākhās*, and that some were, only infinitesimally unlike some others. And it is perhaps possible to point out certain minor points, in which the orthoepical form of the Tāittirīya-text as recorded differs from that to be inferred from the Prātiçākhya.

Among these points we are not allowed to reckon the retention of *h* before surd gutturals and labials and before sibilants (against ix.2), nor of *n* before palatals (against v.24) and *l* (against v.25), nor the omission of *t* (required by v.33) between *t* and *s*, nor of the various duplications and insertions, and aspirations taught in chapter xiv., since these are matters on which we are to expect diseordance between theory and practice. Nor would it be safe to make anything of the consistent and emphatic acceptance in the Sanhitā of *anusvāra* as an alphabetic element, while the Prātiçākhya wavers (see under ii.30) between regarding it as such and as a mere affection of the preceding vowel. Of more consequence is the division of the sections or *anuvākas* in the recorded text into fifties of words, or *kandikās*, which causes the disappearance of more than one specialty of reading expressly prescribed in the treatise (e. g., of the *i* of *ugmasī*, at the end of i.3.6<sup>1</sup>: see under iii.

found (under xx.3) for questioning whether in the *pada*-text belonging to the makers of the Prātiçākhya the peculiar rule followed by the known Tāittirīya *pada*-text as to the accentuation of its separable words was of force. The latter text is of a very peculiar, not to say an anomalous, character in many respects; in these it is supported by the Prātiçākhya, so far as the latter goes (I will instance as examples only the treatment of *yodā* and *evā*, and other cases noticed under iii.15, of *nīcdd*, v.8, and of *ekāikayā*, v.19): whether it does not contain other peculiarities which are ignored by the Prātiçākhya, and which consequently prove it not to be the one which this presupposes, I cannot say; but, from an item or two of information received from Prof. Weber, I imagine that it does so. The question will, at any rate, be cleared up by the discussion of the Tāittirīya *pada*-text which Weber, as I rejoice to learn, intends to add to his transliterated edition of the Sanhitā, now going through the press.

I attribute it only to a (very unusual) awkwardness of statement on the part of the Prātiçākhya, that it appears to leave a part of the words ending in an original *o* out of the category of *pragrahus* (see under iv.7), and so to deny them the right to be followed by *iti*, as they are in fact followed in the known *pada*-text.

The *krama*-text ("word-*krama*") appears to be mentioned in rules xxiii.20 and xxiv.5, and more unequivocally in xxiv.6 (all of them, however, of suspicious authenticity as original parts of the Prātiçākhya: see below); but it is only three times quoted in the comment (under vii.2, ix.17, 20), and so makes but a small figure there as compared with the *jatā*. Examples from the latter are given under iii.1, v.38, viii.8, 12, 16, 35, ix.22, x.9, 10, 13, xi.9, 16, 17, xii.7, xx.2, and sometimes in considerable number and at great length; and once (under xx.2), where the commentator has occasion to mention the various kinds of text, he specifies *sāṁhitā*, *pada*, and *jatā*, ignoring the *krama* altogether. This seems strange, inasmuch as the *jatā* is regarded\* as a secondary form of *krama*, and founded upon it; but the simple explanation appears to be that the *krama* brings up no questions of *sandhi* which do not arise also in *sāṁhitā* and *pada*, and so needs no special attention where only methods of *sandhi* are taught; while the inversions of the *jatā* bring new elements into contact, and so create new cases of combination which require to be settled. If we may trust the commentator's interpretation, rules viii.12, 35 are given expressly for cases that arise only in *jatā*-text; under viii.16, he commits an obviously false explanation in order to reach a *jatā*-case; under v.38, he makes a *sandhi* which the Prātiçākhya certainly never intended, because it is required by the letter of the rule, in a case which the makers of the treatise had apparently overlooked; under xi.16, 17, the *jatā* is resorted to, apparently with reason, for counter-examples to justify the form of statement adopted in the rule. The weight of evidence, upon the whole, is decidedly in favor of

\* See Dr. Thibaut's "Jatāpatala," Leipzig, 1870.

The nature of the tone of a circumflexed syllable, i.46-7; with this is combined an uncertainty of view of the Prātiçākhya itself, expressed in rules 44-5; there is nothing else like it in the treatise; perhaps we may best assume that rules 44-7 are a later intrusion. The mode of production of *anusvāru* and *svarabhukti*, ii.19. The quality of the *a*-element in *āi* and *āu*, ii.27. The phonetic character of *h* and *ḥ*, ii.47-8. The nature of the combination of *e* or *o* with (elided) *u*, xi.19. The occurrence of lingual *l*, xiii.16: this the comment vainly endeavors to make out an accepted doctrine of the Prātiçākhya. A denial of the enclitic circumflex, xiv. 32-3. Nasalization of final vowels, xv.6-8: the comment treats rule 8 as the direct teaching of the text-book. Accent of protracted vowels (?), xv.9. Corruption of the final theme-vowel of neuters in *as*, *is*, *us* in the nom. pl. before *ñ*, xvi.16. Utterance of *āi* final in a single case, xvi.24. Degrees of nasalization, xvii.1-5. Utterance of accents and alphabetic sounds generally, xvii.6-8. *Kampa* between two circumflex syllables, xix.3-5. Use of the term *yama* for the nasal counterparts, xxi.13. Utterance of the syllable *om*, xviii.1-7. *Yama*-tones held by certain schools, xxiii.14-19.

## II. Matters of *sandhi* or euphonic combination.

1. The most important cases in this division are two or three in which the views of different authorities are reported without any clear expression by the treatise of the opinion held, or the rule to be followed, by its school. Thus, with regard to the combination of a final mute with an initial *h*, v.38-41; where, indeed, the view first stated, as that of certain specified teachers, is doubtless to be regarded as that of the Prātiçākhya, notwithstanding the equivocal way in which it is put forward. Again, at ix.1, the dropping of final *h* before a sibilant followed by a surd mute must probably in like manner, though referred to the authority of a single teacher, be taken as a binding rule. And it is hard to believe that rule x. 19, prescribing the invariable omission of final *v*, was not meant to be modified by x.21. That the treatment of *anusvāra* as a distinct consonantal element is put by xv.2-3 upon certain dissidents, must not be looked at by itself alone; it stands connected with the general equivocal attitude assumed by the Prātiçākhya with reference to this vexed question in phonetics (see note to ii.30). Once more, the mode of duplication in groups beginning with *l* as reported in xiv.2-3, with reference to the authorities who teach it, seems to be acknowledged by a later rule (xiv.7) as binding: this interpretation, however, is not free from doubt.

2. In all other cases, the Prātiçākhya is liberal enough to record the opinions of respected authorities upon points as to which its own teachings are distinctly opposed to theirs. Thus, as to the treatment of *m* before *y* and *v*, v.30 and xiii.3 (the repeated mention of this shows it to be regarded as a view entitled to the most respectful consideration); the combination of *p* with *ç* and of *n* with *ç* before a consonant, v.36-7; the *sandhi* of *eshtar* with *rāyali*, viii.19-22; the treatment of *h* before an initial consonant, ix.4-6; the utterance or omission of final *y* and *v*, x.20-23; the insertion

matter in the Sanhitā by position and surroundings merely. There are but two cases of its departure from this method: namely, its use of *alopa* at xiii.15, and of *samkhyāsu* at xvi.25; and in neither one is its success precisely of a character to make us wish it had gone farther in the same direction. This peculiarity renders impossible any profitable comparison of its phraseology with that of other grammatical works.

The general character of the Prātiçākhya is that of an earnest, sensible, consistent treatise, thoroughly worked out and dealing with its proper task with completeness and accuracy, and confining itself quite strictly to that task. There is no labored feebleness and artificial obscurity, as in parts of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiçākhya, nor any inclusion of matters pertaining to general grammar, as in the Atharva-Prātiçākhya. It has its minor inaccuracies and inconsistencies, its obscurities of *anuvṛtti* inseparable from the *sūtra*-style, and its rules that seem to defy interpretation: but these are inconspicuous blemishes; no one of the other works of its class is more thoroughly respectable throughout.

Turning, now, to the more special consideration of the commentary, we have to note, as the most important point, a break of continuity between it and the Prātiçākhya. The commentator is not the recipient of a certain tradition, that gives him surely and precisely the import of the rules which he has to expound; the text-book has come down to him as something authoritative and sacred, indeed, yet in some points obscure, so that he is in doubt as to what it means; in others imperfect, so that it needs emendation; in others not in accordance with the views held by him and his school respecting the text, so that these have to be interpreted into it.

Thus, in the first place, the instances are frequent in which, to his own interpretation of a rule, he adds a different view held by other interpreters: either without naming them (as under i.19,21, xiii.16, xiv.5,11, xvii.5, xxiii.7), or referring to one of his special sources and predecessors (as under ii.19,33), or setting off against one another the views of two of these, Vararuci and Māhiseya (as under ii.14, iv.40, viii.19,20,22, xviii.7). In a large proportion of the instances, it is true, the difference of opinion is upon some utterly trivial point, turning on the interpretation of a *tu* or the like, and only illustrating the hair-splitting tendencies of the native exegetes; but in some cases it is of more consequence, and once goes so far as to question (under viii.20) whether an authority referred to is Uttamottarīya or Dvāvuttamottarīya. Again, where a rule is really obscure, the commentator has sometimes, palpably, nothing more than guesses to give at its meaning, and ventures two or three of them (as under ii.2, xiv.22, xv.9, xix.5, xxiii.17), among which it would be hard to choose the least acceptable; or, if he gives but one (as under xi.19, xviii.4, xxiii.18,19), it is no less unsatisfactory. There are yet other cases in which what seems to be the evident meaning of a rule is misapprehended and distorted,

in the settlement of difficult or controverted points (for the details, see index). Vararuci is a name very common in grammatical literature; to identify our commentator with any other of the various individuals who have worn it would doubtless be daring in the extreme. Nor does Ātreya, probably, stand in any definable relation to the grammarian of that name who is (see p. 430) twice quoted in the Prātiçākhya itself. From Pāṇini, rules are directly quoted under ii.12, iii.9, v.1, xiii.16, xiv.4, xxiv.3; and the *pāṇinīyāyah* or the *vydkarana* are farther referred to under i.15, 53, 57, ii.47, xviii.1. Pāṇinean terms are, further, *nañ*, i.60, x.22, *nic*, ii.17, *hal*, ix.24, *yar*, xiv.4, and *lyap*, xxi.14. The Mahābhāṣya is professedly quoted under ii.7, v.2; but the passage given is actually from Kāiyyatā's gloss. A definition is taken from the Amarakoṣa under i.1. Kāuhaleya is quoted under xix.4, xxiii.17; and the Kālanirṇaya under xviii.1. The Brāhmaṇa of the Vājasaneyins is referred to under xiv.33, and extracts from the Mahābhārata and various Purāṇas are set forth under xxiv.6.

But the authority most often appealed to is the "Cikshā," by which the commentator intends a very different work from the *pāṇinīyācikshā*, and one much more comprehensive. He takes extracts from it, of a verse, or part of a verse, or more than one verse, under i.1 (three times), ii.2, xiv.5, 28, xix.3, xx.12, xxi.1, 15, xxii.13, xxiii.10, 17. Among these extracts are (under i.1, ii.2, xxi.1, xxiii.10) several passages which are found also in the *pāṇinīyācikshā*; and among the metrical extracts which are now and then given without specifying their source (under xiv.23, 26, 28, xix.3, xxi.1, 6, 15, xxiii.17, 19, xxiv.6) are likewise one or two (under xxiii.17, 19) which occur in the same treatise. That the commentator is inclined to regard his Cikshā as of higher authority than the Prātiçākhya itself was pointed out under xx.12; that it was a work specially appertaining to the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā may be inferred with probability from the words which it cites (under xxi.15) in illustration of the varieties of *svarabhakti*.

rants, ii.44,45; of *h*, ii.6,9,46,47; of *visarjaniya*, ii.46,48; of *anusvāra*, ii.19, 30; of *násikyas* (*yamas* etc.), ii.49–51; of *svarabhakti*, ii.19.

### 3. Quantity:

quantity of short and long vowels, i.31–3,35; of protracted vowels, i.36; of consonants, i.37; of *anusvāra* (or nasalized vowel), i.34, xvii.5; of syllables (“heavy” and “light”), xxii.14,15; of pauses and hiatus, xxii.13; of *om*, xviii.1.

### 4. Accent:

general character of accents: acute, i.38, xxii.9; grave, i.39, xxii.10; circumflex, i.40–47, xvii.6.—varieties of independent circumflex: *nitya* or original, xx.2; its quality, xx.9: *ksháipra*, xx.1; its occurrence, x.16; its quality, xx.9: *abhinihata*, xx.4; its occurrence, xii.9; its quality, xx.10: *prākliṣṭa*, xx.5; its occurrence, x.17; its quality, xx.11.—enclitic circumflex: its occurrence, xiv.29–33; its varieties: *prāthītū*, xx.3; its quality, xx.11: *pādavṛttā*, xx.6; its quality, xx.12: *tāirovyanāñjana*, xx.7; its quality, xx.12.—*pracaya* accent, xxi.10,11.—*vikrama*, xix.1,2; its quality, xvii.6.—*kampa*, between two circumflexes, xix.3–5.—accent resulting from combination of two syllables into one, x.10,12,16,17, xii.9–11.—accent of *om*, xviii.2,3,5–7.—accent of protracted vowel (?), xv.9.

### 5. Syllabication:

division of syllables, xxi.1–9.

### 6. Mode and tones of utterance:

general mode of utterance, xxiii.20; the three *sthānas* or qualities, xxii.11; the seven *do*, xxii.4–10; the twenty-one *yamas* or tones, xxii.12, xxiiii.11–19.—tone of *om*, xviii.4.

## III. SANDHI OR EUPHONIC COMBINATION:

introductory, v.1–3; four kinds of combination, xxiv.1–4.

### 1. Final vowels:

final vowels not liable to combination, *pragrahas*, iv.1–54; x.24; special cases of uncombinable finals, x.13,18; protracted finals, x.24; their nasalization, xv.7,8,—nasalization of final vowels, xv.6.—the particle *u*, ix.16,17.—lengthening of final *a*, iii.2–6,8–12; of final *i* and *u*, iii.7,13,14.

combination of simple final vowels: with similar initial, x.2; of final *a* with initial vowels, x.4–9; exceptions, x.13; lost in certain cases before *e* or *o*, x.14; *i*, *i*, *u*, final, x.15, ix.17; exceptions, ix.16, x.18.—combination of final diphthongs, ix.11,12,14,15; *e* and *o* with initial *a* (see also Initial vowels), ix.13; treatment of the resulting *y* and *v*, x.19–23; after their loss, no further combination, x.25.

accent resulting from combinations of final vowels, x.10,12,16,17, xx.1,5,9,11; resulting nasalization, x.11.

### 2. Initial vowels:

initial vowel lengthened, iii.15.—loss of *a* after final *e* or *o*, ix.13, xi.1; detail of cases of loss, and exceptions, xi.2–19, xii.1–8; resulting accent, xii.9–11, xx.4,10.—? to *ar* in special case, v.9.

## INDEX OF CITATIONS

MADE IN THE COMMENTARY, FROM THE TĀITTIRĪYA-SANHITĀ.

THIS Index contains the references reported above in the body of the work, as made by the commentator to the fundamental text. If, however, a cited word or passage is reported as occurring more than once in the text, reference is given only to the first occurrence. It has been found impracticable to carry out any scheme of distinction of the value of the citations; and any one using the Index will have to turn back to the notes in order to determine whether a given passage is quoted merely as an example of some general class, or as one that was more or less probably had directly in view, as example or counter-example, by the makers of the treatise; whether it is a unique phrase, or one more than once repeated, or even a word of frequent occurrence—and so on.

TS. i.	TS. i.	TS. i.
1.1 i.21,33, ii.22, iii.1,3, ix.	2.12 <sup>1</sup> xi.11,17; <sup>2</sup> xvi.27.	4.14 ii.44, ix.4.
1, x.5,10,19, xiv.21,	13 <sup>1</sup> iii.2, iv.34; <sup>2</sup> iii.7, iv.	16 xvi.13.
xvii.7, xviii.1,7, xx.	15,22,33, xvi.2; <sup>3</sup> iv.	18 iv.41, xi.16.
3, xxi.7, xxii.13.	46, xi.17.	19 vi.7, ix.20.
2 <sup>1</sup> xiii.2, xv.1, xxl.15; <sup>2</sup> x.	14 <sup>1</sup> iii.8, ix.20,23, xii.7,	20 xv.1, xvii.4.
2, xxiv.5.	xvi.15,27; <sup>2</sup> i.48, ii.47,	22 iii.12, iv.4,12, xvi.13,29.
3 iv.6, viii.8, xvi.27.	iv.28, v.8, vi.5, viii.24,	24 vi.5, xi.13.
4 <sup>1</sup> viii.8.	x.16, xii.15, xiv.6,	25 xiii.9.
5 <sup>1</sup> iv.44, ix.22, x.25, xi.16;	xvi.18; <sup>2</sup> i.56, v.15;	26 iv.42.
2 <sup>1</sup> vi.11, xiii.7, xxiv.4.	<sup>3</sup> v.17, vii.10, xvi.14;	27 vi.7, viii.27.
7 <sup>1</sup> x.10.	<sup>4</sup> xiv.10, xvi.13; <sup>5</sup> viii.	30 iv.11.
8 vi.5, x.2,6, xi.8,16, xiv.1.	8; <sup>6</sup> iii.8; <sup>7</sup> vii.11, xi.	33 i.55, iii.14, vi.5, xi.3.
9 <sup>1</sup> vi.10, vii.14; <sup>2</sup> iii.15, v.	4, xvi.2; <sup>7</sup> vi.2, viii.24,	36 viii.32.
2,21, x.12 bis, xi.16,	xvi.25.	41 ii.49, xiv.24.
xiv.12,13.	3.1 <sup>1</sup> i.61.	42 vii.16, ix.20.
10 <sup>1</sup> vi.5, vii.14, xiv.10, xvi.	2 <sup>1</sup> vii.11; <sup>2</sup> iv.12, vii.11,	43 <sup>1</sup> i.61, xi.9; <sup>2</sup> xvi.26.
2,27; <sup>2</sup> v.3, vi.4, xi.16;	xiv.28.	44 <sup>1</sup> vii.2, x.8, xii.5,7, xiii.
<sup>3</sup> ii.48, viii.13, ix.2, xvi.	3 i.51,60, iii.1, vii.6 ter.	4, xxiv.5; <sup>2</sup> viii.3, ix.
14.	4 <sup>1</sup> vii.26; xii.13,16.	22, xii.7, xvi.13 bis.
11 <sup>1</sup> xiii.6.	5 xiv.26.	45 <sup>1</sup> iii.2, vi.5; <sup>2</sup> viii.24, xii.
12 iii.3, v.5, viii.8, xi.17,	6 <sup>1</sup> iv.42; <sup>2</sup> i.18; <sup>3</sup> ii.3,	12, xxi.4; <sup>4</sup> ix.21, xi.
xiv.19.	x.10; end <sup>g</sup> xxiv.6.	7, xv.4.
13 <sup>1</sup> ii.20, ix.22 bis; <sup>2</sup> xiii.10	7 <sup>1</sup> iii.8, vi.11,47, viii.16;	46 <sup>1</sup> xii.8, xiv.30,31, xx.8;
bis, xvi.26; <sup>3</sup> iv.12, ix.	<sup>2</sup> viii.9, xi.16.	<sup>2</sup> xiii.15.
9, xii.8, xxi.12.	8 <sup>1</sup> iii.8; <sup>2</sup> iii.2, ix.22.	5.1 <sup>1</sup> v.28,30, xiv.23, xvii.2;
14 <sup>1</sup> i.61, iii.8,9,10; <sup>2</sup> iii.23,	9 <sup>1</sup> i.37, v.38 bis, viii.2,	<sup>2</sup> ix.19, x.10,13; <sup>3</sup> v.
xi.3, xii.7; <sup>3</sup> i.61, xi.3,	xiv.12,20 bis, xxi.3.	28,30, xx.7.
9, xiii.16; <sup>4</sup> iii.12, v.	10 <sup>1</sup> xi.17; <sup>2</sup> xiii.14, xvi.23.	2 <sup>1</sup> ix.20, xiv.23; <sup>3</sup> iv.16;
17, vi.5 bis, vii.5,10,	11 xi.17.	<sup>4</sup> iv.15; <sup>5</sup> x.10.
ix.22, x.10,25, xii.3.	12 ix.21, xi.18.	3 <sup>1</sup> ii.48; <sup>2</sup> xiv.18; <sup>3</sup> ii.8,
2.1 <sup>1</sup> ix.10, x.19,22,25, xi.8,	13 <sup>1</sup> v.18; <sup>2</sup> iv.20, viii.9.	ix.22.
xviii.7; <sup>2</sup> xi.18.	14 <sup>1</sup> i.61, iii.12, ix.23, xiv.	4 <sup>2</sup> xx.8; <sup>4</sup> v.28,31, xiv.28,
2 <sup>1</sup> iv.47, xiv.9; <sup>2</sup> iv.42;	23, xvi.17, xx.12; <sup>2</sup> iii.	5 <sup>1</sup> i.38, xi.3 bis, xiv.9,19,
<sup>2</sup> xxi.8; <sup>3</sup> vi.12, x.2,	10; <sup>2</sup> vii.12; <sup>3</sup> x.15,	27; <sup>2</sup> xxi.18; <sup>4</sup> iii.4.
17.	xii.7; <sup>4</sup> i.61; <sup>5</sup> vii.9,	6 <sup>1</sup> x.10, xiv.23; <sup>2</sup> iii.8,
3 <sup>1</sup> xi.13 bis; <sup>2</sup> iii.5, xi.8.	viii.28,34, xi.5; <sup>6</sup> iii.	viii.8; <sup>7</sup> iii.8, xi.18;
4 <sup>1</sup> xi.3, xxl.3; <sup>2</sup> xi.3.	5; <sup>7</sup> iv.6, xvi.14;	<sup>4</sup> iii.5, v.32, xiv.5,12,
5 <sup>1</sup> xiv.29; xx.1,7.	<sup>8</sup> viii.31, ix.22.	13, xxi.5.
6 xi.10,17, xiii.10, xvi.29,	4.1 <sup>1</sup> iii.5, ix.20, xiii.15; <sup>2</sup> iv.	7 <sup>1</sup> xi.18; <sup>3</sup> iv.38; <sup>4</sup> ii.49,
xxl.6.	38, vi.13.	v.15,37, xiv.24; <sup>6</sup> iii.5,
7 iii.5, iv.9 bis, xiv.28.	2 viii.27.	vi.14, xvi.27.
8 <sup>1</sup> ix.21,22, x.10, xi.16,17;	3 viii.10.	8 <sup>5</sup> xi.16.
<sup>2</sup> i.56, v.10.	4 xi.10.	9 <sup>1</sup> ii.47, iv.33, xiv.1;
9 iii.2, viii.27,28.	9 v.27, xxi.12.	<sup>2</sup> xiv.4, xvi.29; <sup>3</sup> ix.
10 <sup>1</sup> iii.8, ix.21; <sup>2</sup> iv.52.	10 iv.42, vi.4.	22; <sup>4</sup> vi.7, xiv.31,
11 <sup>1</sup> viii.8,18-22,29,	11 xi.16, xvi.25.	xvii.1; <sup>6</sup> x.9; <sup>7</sup> iv.11,
xvi.29; <sup>2</sup> xi.16.	13 xi.17.	v.20,24, viii.7, x.10.

TS. ii.

6.12 <sup>1</sup>ii.49, xiii.15; <sup>2</sup>ii.12, xiv.5, 28; <sup>3</sup>ix.21, xi.4; <sup>4</sup>i.21, iii.9, xi.4; <sup>5</sup>xiv.5; <sup>6</sup>xii.7, xv.4, xvi.2.

TS. iii.

1.1 <sup>1</sup>v.15.

2 <sup>1</sup>v.15.

3 <sup>1</sup>i.59, iv.52.

4 <sup>1</sup>ix.21, xi.10, xvi.29; <sup>2</sup>iv.28; <sup>3</sup>ix.22 bis; <sup>4</sup>x.14; <sup>5</sup>vi.14.

6 <sup>1</sup>x.8, 10.

7 <sup>1</sup>ix.3; <sup>2</sup>ii.5; <sup>3</sup>iv.36, xvi.20

8 <sup>2</sup>xiii.9; <sup>3</sup>xi.10.

9 <sup>1</sup>vi.14; <sup>2</sup>ix.21, xi.9, 18;

<sup>3</sup>xiv.18, xvi.20.

10 <sup>1</sup>xi.3 <sup>2</sup>vii.15, viii.28 bis, ix.20, 21.

11 <sup>1</sup>iii.3, ix.20; <sup>2</sup>viii.8, 29, xiv.24, xvi.13; <sup>3</sup>iv.11; <sup>4</sup>xiii.9; <sup>5</sup>v.2, x.13, xv.6; <sup>6</sup>iii.8, xii.8; <sup>7</sup>xv.4; <sup>8</sup>iii.8.10, x.12, xvi.21, xx.2.

2.2 <sup>1</sup>i.53, xi.17, xvii.18, 29 bis; <sup>2</sup>v.7, xi.5; <sup>3</sup>i.40, iv.24, v.33, vii.14 bis, xiv.18, 19, xxi.16.

3 <sup>1</sup>viii.29, xlii.4.

4 <sup>1</sup>ii.20, iv.42, xi.15, 16; <sup>2</sup>iv.47, viii.24; <sup>3</sup>iv.38, vii.10.

5 <sup>1</sup>v.8, viii.29, ix.16; <sup>2</sup>i.50, iv.11; <sup>3</sup>v.13, xi.12, xxi.16; <sup>4</sup>iv.46, vi.14; <sup>7</sup>xi.17.

6 <sup>1</sup>viii.8.

7 <sup>1</sup>viii.8.

8 <sup>1</sup>v.8, xi.8, xlii.15, xiv.5; <sup>2</sup>vi.2; <sup>3</sup>ii.8, viii.23, ix.19, xi.8, xii.8 bis; <sup>4</sup>iv.35, xi.8; <sup>5</sup>viii.6, ix.22 bis.

9 <sup>1</sup>iv.54, viii.3, xxiv.5; <sup>2</sup>vi.14; <sup>3</sup>iv.4, xvi.2; <sup>7</sup>viii.34, ix.18, xvi.2.

10 <sup>1</sup>iv.35, v.27, vii.27, 31, xiv.28, xx.8.

11 <sup>1</sup>iii.11, iv.6, 7, xii.6; <sup>2</sup>viii.24; <sup>3</sup>ix.24; <sup>4</sup>iv.12, x.12, xii.2, xiv.29, xv.1, 3, xvii.4, xxiv.4.

8.1 <sup>1</sup>v.10.

2 <sup>1</sup>viii.8, xiv.24.

3 <sup>1</sup>xi.16.

4 <sup>1</sup>ii.25, 30.

6 <sup>1</sup>iv.40.

7 <sup>1</sup>iv.12, xv.6.

8 <sup>1</sup>iv.40; <sup>2</sup>v.9, xi.16, 17, xiv.30, xvi.27; <sup>6</sup>ii.6.

9 <sup>1</sup>viii.8.

10 <sup>1</sup>iii.12, vii.2; <sup>2</sup>iv.12, 34, xi.17, xv.5.

11 <sup>1</sup>i.43, 46, 47, 52, iv.35, v.18, xlii.2, xvii.6; <sup>3</sup>xii.7; <sup>4</sup>viii.26; <sup>5</sup>vii.9, xvi.18.

TS. iii.

4.2 <sup>2</sup>ii.12.

3 <sup>1</sup>iv.42 bis, 52; <sup>2</sup>iv.24; <sup>3</sup>xlii.7; <sup>7</sup>xiii.12.

4 <sup>1</sup>v.23.

7 <sup>1</sup>xiii.15, xxi.12.

8 <sup>2</sup>xiv.23; <sup>4</sup>v.24, viii.4, <sup>8</sup>v.33.

9 <sup>7</sup>iv.7, 11.

10 <sup>1</sup>viii.27, xi.17; <sup>3</sup>vii.8.

11 <sup>2</sup>xii.7; <sup>4</sup>iii.10; <sup>5</sup>iii.7, <sup>7</sup>xlii.13, xiv.28; <sup>6</sup>xlii.7.

5.1 <sup>1</sup>vi.9, xlii.15.

2 <sup>2</sup>xvi.14.

3 <sup>1</sup>ix.22, xlii.15; <sup>2</sup>xi.10.

4 <sup>1</sup>xi.16; <sup>2</sup>ii.12; <sup>3</sup>vii.14,

xi.16, xxi.12.

5 <sup>2</sup>ii.25, xvi.14; <sup>3</sup>i.49, iii.2, xi.16, xvi.17.

6 <sup>1</sup>viii.27; <sup>2</sup>ii.5.

7 <sup>1</sup>vi.2; <sup>3</sup>v.24, xiv.18.

8 <sup>3</sup>iii.7, 15, xiv.2, 22.

10 <sup>1</sup>v.50, vi.10.

11 <sup>1</sup>i.51, iii.7, 11, v.21, vi.2; <sup>2</sup>ii.12, xvi.18; <sup>4</sup>iii.11, vii.11.

TS. iv.

1.1 <sup>1</sup>ix.4, 5, 6; <sup>2</sup>vii.6, xi.3; <sup>3</sup>iii.5.

2 <sup>1</sup>i.61, xvii.5, xxi.11;

<sup>2</sup>xlii.6 bis, xlii.9, 14;

<sup>3</sup>xii.23, xiv.5; <sup>4</sup>viii.8; <sup>5</sup>i.61, viii.24, xxi.5.

3 <sup>1</sup>iv.52, xii.6; <sup>2</sup>iv.11 bis, 19 bis, viii.10, ix.18;

<sup>4</sup>iii.8, xii.4, 6.

4 <sup>1</sup>i.61, iii.8; <sup>2</sup>i.61, iii.12, 14, vi.2, vii.2 bis;

<sup>3</sup>iii.5.

5 <sup>1</sup>iii.1.8, 10, vi.2, 4; <sup>2</sup>xvi.2; <sup>3</sup>ix.1.

6 <sup>1</sup>ix.7.

7 <sup>2</sup>xi.4; <sup>3</sup>xlii.8; <sup>4</sup>viii.24, vii.7.

8 <sup>1</sup>iv.2; <sup>2</sup>ii.57; <sup>3</sup>iv.20, v.12, xii.7 bis, xxiv.5;

<sup>4</sup>xlii.4; <sup>5</sup>iv.20, 27.

9 <sup>2</sup>viii.28, xx.2; <sup>3</sup>iii.8, viii.10, xii.7 bis, xiv.5.

10 <sup>1</sup>xi.7, xxi.12; <sup>2</sup>viii.29, xii.7, xii.12, xiv.1, xvi.19; <sup>3</sup>v.35, vi.14, ix.24, xlii.2, xiv.5, xv.1, xvii.4; <sup>4</sup>iv.11, xii.4; <sup>5</sup>viii.16, 18, xii.7; <sup>6</sup>viii.27, xii.2.

11 <sup>1</sup>v.17, viii.32; <sup>2</sup>iv.11, xii.4, xiv.19; <sup>3</sup>v.12, xii.3, xvii.4; <sup>4</sup>iv.11 bis, 19 bis, 23 bis.

2.1 <sup>2</sup>ix.3, xii.7; <sup>5</sup>ii.60, vi.2.

2 <sup>1</sup>iii.10, xxi.12; <sup>3</sup>xii.7.

3 <sup>1</sup>xi.8, 10, xiv.5, xvi.18;

<sup>2</sup>ii.10, vi.5, xii.14; <sup>3</sup>xii.14;

<sup>4</sup>viii.17, viii.8, x.10, 25, xii.3; <sup>5</sup>ii.8, xi.5, xvi.28.

TS. iv.

2.4 <sup>1</sup>xii.7; <sup>2</sup>xvi.18; <sup>3</sup>iii.5, vii.7, xii.7, xvi.19; <sup>4</sup>xvi.25.

5 <sup>2</sup>viii.8; <sup>3</sup>xii.12, xiv.9, 11; <sup>4</sup>viii.7, <sup>5</sup>ii.5.

6 <sup>1</sup>viii.28, x.22; <sup>3</sup>xii.8; <sup>4</sup>ii.2, viii.32; <sup>5</sup>v.22.

7 <sup>2</sup>xvi.18.

8 <sup>1</sup>iv.5, vi.2, viii.6, x.15,

19, xiv.5, xx.8; <sup>2</sup>vi.32; <sup>3</sup>i.61, ix.20, xi.3, xii.7.

9 <sup>1</sup>iii.15, v.12, x.13, xii.2, 7; <sup>2</sup>iv.45, viii.28, xiv.23, 29, xx.3, xxii.11; <sup>3</sup>ix.20.

10 <sup>1</sup>xv.5; <sup>2</sup>xvi.2, 13; <sup>3</sup>iii.15, xii.8.

11 <sup>1</sup>iv.15, 40, viii.34; <sup>2</sup>iii.5, 10 bis; <sup>3</sup>v.16, vi.3, x.16, 19, xxii.4.

3.1 <sup>1</sup>iv.11, vi.4, x.14 bis.

2 <sup>1</sup>ii.32, iv.28; <sup>2</sup>v.34, 36.

3 <sup>1</sup>iv.33; <sup>2</sup>i.54, 55, ix.16.

4 <sup>1</sup>xi.3, xv.6; <sup>2</sup>ii.3; <sup>3</sup>viii.25, xi.3.

5 xvi.27.

9 <sup>1</sup>vii.2.

11 <sup>1</sup>iv.20, xi.3 ter, 5; <sup>2</sup>vi.13, vii.6; <sup>3</sup>vi.14, xvii.4.

12 <sup>1</sup>iii.8; <sup>2</sup>vi.13, viii.4; <sup>3</sup>vi.18, xiv.5.

13 <sup>1</sup>iii.9, vii.12, ix.22, xii.3; <sup>2</sup>iv.11, v.17, x.25;

<sup>3</sup>ix.23, xvi.19; <sup>4</sup>iii.10, ix.20, xii.7, xiii.6;

<sup>5</sup>vi.5, xi.4; <sup>6</sup>iii.7, v.2, x.13; <sup>7</sup>xiii.9, 15; <sup>8</sup>iii.10.

4.2 <sup>1</sup>xiv.1.29, xx.6, 7, xxii.18; <sup>2</sup>xiv.10, 11; <sup>3</sup>iv.12, 52.

8 <sup>2</sup>xlii.16; <sup>3</sup>xi.17.

4 <sup>1</sup>v.10, xi.3, xiv.16; <sup>2</sup>xi.18; <sup>3</sup>i.88, 41, viii.31, xiv.29, 33, xx.6, 8, xxi.18; <sup>4</sup>v.5, xiv.10, 17; <sup>5</sup>ii.9, 10, vi.5, xii.6, xiv.16.

5 <sup>1</sup>xiii.12, 15.

6 <sup>2</sup>vi.12.

7 <sup>2</sup>xxi.12.

9 vii.6, xii.8.

10 <sup>1</sup>iv.12; <sup>2</sup>ii.7, lv.11.

11 <sup>1</sup>iv.5; <sup>2</sup>v.2, x.18, xi.11, xxii.14.

12 <sup>1</sup>ix.20, xi.3, 4; <sup>2</sup>xi.3; end'g xxiv.6.

5.1 <sup>1</sup>iv.48; <sup>2</sup>v.20; <sup>3</sup>xii.3, xii.7; <sup>4</sup>iv.48, 54, ix.21, xiii.9, xiv.8.

2 <sup>1</sup>ii.7, xii.12.

3 <sup>1</sup>xvii.1; <sup>2</sup>xi.14, 17.

4 <sup>1</sup>xii.12.

5 <sup>1</sup>viii.30, xiii.11; <sup>2</sup>xi.14.

6 <sup>1</sup>xiv.7.

8 <sup>1</sup>xi.14.

TS. vi.	TS. vi.	TS. vii.
1.1 <sup>1</sup> xvi.21; <sup>2</sup> iv.17, xiv.11; <sup>3</sup> vii.18; <sup>4</sup> viii.34; <sup>5</sup> vix.3,	4.8 <sup>2</sup> xvi.29. <sup>9</sup> viii.23, xiv.17. <sup>10</sup> iv.40, xlii.18, xiv.28, xvii.3; <sup>2</sup> viii.35; <sup>3</sup> iv.11; end'g viii.35, xxiv.6.	2.17 xvi.25 bis. <sup>3</sup> i.13.12; <sup>4</sup> iii.15. <sup>2</sup> i.1x.20. <sup>4</sup> i.v.21. <sup>5</sup> viii.13. <sup>8</sup> i.xii.10. <sup>9</sup> viii.13. <sup>10</sup> s.iv.11, xiv.16. <sup>12</sup> v.33, xiv.5, xxi.9,12, xxiv.5. <sup>13</sup> xi.17, xiv.18. <sup>14</sup> ii.30, xiii.9, xvii.1. <sup>15</sup> xiii.14. <sup>16</sup> i.22, iii.7 bis, x.14; <sup>2</sup> ii.7, xvi.30. <sup>17</sup> x.14, xvi.30. <sup>18</sup> vi.12, xiii.12. <sup>4.2</sup> s.v.32, viii.18, ix.18. <sup>3</sup> v.i.14; <sup>4</sup> i.7; <sup>5</sup> v.8. <sup>4</sup> s.iv.54; <sup>5</sup> iv.52. <sup>5</sup> i.v.51, viii.13; <sup>2</sup> vii.2. <sup>7</sup> s.xiv.1. <sup>8</sup> i.v.52; <sup>2</sup> iii.4; <sup>3</sup> x.10. <sup>9</sup> xvi.13. <sup>10</sup> i.vi.13; <sup>2</sup> vii.8. <sup>11</sup> i.vi.2,18; <sup>2</sup> iv.12; <sup>3</sup> iv.53. <sup>13</sup> iii.7, xiv.16, xxi.16. <sup>15</sup> iii.10, xi.17, xvi.20. <sup>17</sup> i.xi.6. <sup>19</sup> i.x 10, xi.17, xvi.18; <sup>3</sup> xiii.12, xvi.2; <sup>4</sup> xvi.13. <sup>20</sup> viii.8, xi.6,7, xiii.12,15, xv.8, xvi.18, xx.7. <sup>21</sup> vi.12
3 <sup>1</sup> iv.11,24,38,42 bis, vi.7, viii.16, xlii.6; <sup>2</sup> xii.6; <sup>3</sup> viii.15; <sup>4</sup> iii.7, vii.6; <sup>5</sup> viii.6.	5.1 <sup>2</sup> xviii.32. <sup>2</sup> xiv.6. <sup>3</sup> iv.24; <sup>4</sup> iv.23, xvi.12. <sup>5</sup> s.viii.2. <sup>6</sup> i.v.31. <sup>8</sup> s.vii.21, iv.7; <sup>4</sup> i.4,58, viii.27, xv.8, xvi.13; <sup>6</sup> i.59, iii.15, iv.53, viii.8, end'g xxiv.6.	4.2 s.v.32, viii.18, ix.18. <sup>3</sup> v.i.14; <sup>4</sup> i.7; <sup>5</sup> v.8. <sup>4</sup> s.iv.54; <sup>5</sup> iv.52. <sup>5</sup> i.v.51, viii.13; <sup>2</sup> vii.2. <sup>7</sup> s.xiv.1. <sup>8</sup> i.v.52; <sup>2</sup> iii.4; <sup>3</sup> x.10. <sup>9</sup> xvi.13. <sup>10</sup> i.vi.13; <sup>2</sup> vii.8. <sup>11</sup> i.vi.2,18; <sup>2</sup> iv.12; <sup>3</sup> iv.53. <sup>13</sup> iii.7, xiv.16, xxi.16. <sup>15</sup> iii.10, xi.17, xvi.20. <sup>17</sup> i.xi.6. <sup>19</sup> i.x 10, xi.17, xvi.18; <sup>3</sup> xiii.12, xvi.2; <sup>4</sup> xvi.13. <sup>20</sup> viii.8, xi.6,7, xiii.12,15, xv.8, xvi.18, xx.7. <sup>21</sup> vi.12
6 <sup>4</sup> i.48, xiv.1,5; <sup>5</sup> iv.42, viii.31; <sup>6</sup> ix.22; <sup>7</sup> iv.28, xlii.9,12, xxi.7. <sup>7</sup> s.viii.9; <sup>8</sup> i.59. <sup>8</sup> i.v.44,45.	10 <sup>2</sup> xviii.9. <sup>11</sup> i.vil.16; <sup>4</sup> vi.10, xi.17, xiii.7. <sup>6.1</sup> i.v.9. <sup>2</sup> xvi.16; <sup>3</sup> i.54. <sup>3</sup> viii.30, xvi.14; <sup>2</sup> viii.38; <sup>8</sup> s.viii.33. <sup>4</sup> i.xlii.16; <sup>2</sup> xvi.13; <sup>3</sup> i.30, 59, iv.35, x.10; <sup>6</sup> v.14. <sup>5</sup> s.vi.10, x.10; <sup>2</sup> xiv.20. <sup>7</sup> s.xi.12. <sup>8</sup> i.v.28. <sup>10</sup> s.v.10, xvi.29. <sup>11</sup> i.v.32, xiv.12,13, xxi.4; <sup>4</sup> iv.11, vii.11; <sup>5</sup> xvi.6.	4.2 s.v.32, viii.18, ix.18. <sup>3</sup> v.i.14; <sup>4</sup> i.7; <sup>5</sup> v.8. <sup>4</sup> s.iv.54; <sup>5</sup> iv.52. <sup>5</sup> i.v.51, viii.13; <sup>2</sup> vii.2. <sup>7</sup> s.xiv.1. <sup>8</sup> i.v.52; <sup>2</sup> iii.4; <sup>3</sup> x.10. <sup>9</sup> xvi.13. <sup>10</sup> i.vi.13; <sup>2</sup> vii.8. <sup>11</sup> i.vi.2,18; <sup>2</sup> iv.12; <sup>3</sup> iv.53. <sup>13</sup> iii.7, xiv.16, xxi.16. <sup>15</sup> iii.10, xi.17, xvi.20. <sup>17</sup> i.xi.6. <sup>19</sup> i.x 10, xi.17, xvi.18; <sup>3</sup> xiii.12, xvi.2; <sup>4</sup> xvi.13. <sup>20</sup> viii.8, xi.6,7, xiii.12,15, xv.8, xvi.18, xx.7. <sup>21</sup> vi.12
2 <sup>7</sup> i.viii.8. <sup>3</sup> v.7; <sup>4</sup> viii.8; <sup>5</sup> v.18. <sup>4</sup> i.v.25, x.10,17, xx.5,6; <sup>2</sup> viii.17. <sup>6</sup> s.vi.21; <sup>7</sup> i.vi.6, xvi.9. <sup>8</sup> s.iv.11; <sup>9</sup> s.vi.16. <sup>9</sup> i.vi.11 bis, <sup>10</sup> s.viii.33; <sup>4</sup> v.10, vi.8, xvi.2 bis, xx.8. <sup>11</sup> i.159, iv.11; <sup>3</sup> iv.5,11 bis, v.9, xlii.14; <sup>4</sup> ii.44, iv.11, vii.11, viii.16, xiv.8. <sup>3.1</sup> s.v.6, ix.22; <sup>5</sup> ii.30, v.32,38. <sup>2</sup> s.viii.14, xiv.22; <sup>6</sup> s.vi.7. <sup>3</sup> s.v.38,39,40, xiv.12; <sup>5</sup> s.viii.15. <sup>4</sup> s.vi.8; <sup>6</sup> s.vi.5. <sup>5</sup> s.v.52. <sup>6</sup> s.viii.8, xlii.15. <sup>7</sup> s.vxi.7. <sup>9</sup> i.viii.14; <sup>10</sup> s.xi.16; <sup>11</sup> s.viii.7; <sup>12</sup> s.vi.12. <sup>10</sup> i.viii.8; <sup>11</sup> s.vi.20; <sup>12</sup> s.viii.6; <sup>13</sup> s.vii.10. <sup>11</sup> s.vi.11,24; <sup>14</sup> s.vi.2. <sup>4.1</sup> s.vi.14, xvi.14. <sup>2</sup> s.vi.25. <sup>3</sup> s.vi.6,14; <sup>4</sup> s.viii.23; <sup>5</sup> s.vii.8, xx.8. <sup>4</sup> i.vi.29; <sup>5</sup> s.vi.8, xvi.29 bis. <sup>5</sup> s.vi.16, xiv.17; <sup>6</sup> s.vi.29; <sup>7</sup> s.vxi.29. <sup>6</sup> s.vii.10, ix.20, xvi.29; <sup>8</sup> s.viii.10. <sup>7</sup> s.vi.148, iv.40, v.23, xiv.1; <sup>9</sup> s.vii.12 bis, viii.2.	5.1 <sup>2</sup> xviii.1; <sup>3</sup> iv.18,31, xvi.18. <sup>3</sup> i.vi.14; <sup>2</sup> v.20. <sup>4</sup> s.vi.11, xx.2, xxi.11. <sup>5</sup> i.vi.14; <sup>6</sup> s.v.22; <sup>7</sup> x.10, xii.11, xiv.31; <sup>8</sup> s.vii.7. <sup>6</sup> i.v.24, xv.7, xxiv.5; <sup>7</sup> s.vi.29; <sup>8</sup> s.vi.6; <sup>9</sup> s.viii.12; <sup>10</sup> s.vi.15, v.9, vii.5, xlii.12, xiv.2,31, 26; <sup>11</sup> s.vi.17. <sup>7</sup> s.viii.9. <sup>8</sup> s.vi.12, x.17, xx.5,8. <sup>9</sup> s.vi.21. <sup>12</sup> x.10. <sup>19</sup> s.v.12, vi.12, vii.5, xlii.14, xvi.22; <sup>14</sup> s.vi.14, xvi.22. <sup>2.1</sup> s.vi.52; <sup>3</sup> s.vi.24; <sup>4</sup> x.10. <sup>2</sup> i.vi.25; <sup>3</sup> s.vi.24; <sup>4</sup> x.10. <sup>4</sup> s.viii.9. <sup>5</sup> s.viii.4. <sup>6</sup> s.vi.31; <sup>7</sup> s.vi.54. <sup>7</sup> s.vii.10, xi.16. <sup>8</sup> s.vi.6, viii.18. <sup>9</sup> s.vi.11. <sup>10</sup> s.vi.13, xvi.29; <sup>11</sup> s.vi.2, viii.2, xvi.22. <sup>12</sup> s.vi.13; <sup>13</sup> s.vi.18, xiv.23, xvi.10. <sup>14</sup> s.vi.8. <sup>15</sup> s.vi.8, xvi.14. <sup>16</sup> s.vi.22. <sup>20</sup> s.vi.16. <sup>22</sup> s.vi.29. <sup>24</sup> s.vi.20, xi.18. <sup>25</sup> s.vi.13; <sup>26</sup> s.vi.1.	

<i>adyā</i> , iii.5,8 (instead of <i>aghād</i> ).	<i>anukarshana</i> , c.xiv.28.	<i>antar āsyām</i> , xii.7.
<i>adyā'nu</i> , xii.7.	<i>anuccāraṇa</i> , c.iv.23.	<i>antarād</i> , iv.20.
<i>adruta</i> , xxii.20.	<i>anuitama</i> , xiv.24, xxi.12.	<i>antarātman</i> , c.ii.41.
<i>adharānt sapatnā</i> , ix.22.	<i>anudātta</i> , i.39,45,46, iii.15, iv.43, vi.4, viii.9, x.12,16, xii.9,10, xiv.29, xviii.8, xviii.2, xx.2, xxi.10:-c.x.10, xii.6, xxii.10, xxiii.16,17.	<i>antarhita</i> , xiv.30.
<i>adharoshtha</i> , c.li.39,43.	<i>anudāttatara</i> , c.i.44.	<i>antasthā</i> , i.8, v.28, xxi.7:-c.i.1, xiv.28.
<i>adhastāt</i> , c.ii.28.	<i>anundāsika</i> , ii.30, v.26-8, 31, x.11, xv.1,6, xxi.14:-c.i.1, ii.19,30, v.29-31, xiv.23, xv.7-9, xvii.1 (-tā): and <i>sānum-</i> , <i>ānu-</i> <i>nāsikya</i> .	<i>antodātta</i> , xvi.5:-c.viii.10.
<i>adha</i> , iii.9.	<i>anupāda</i> , c.xxiv.6.	<i>antya</i> , i.58:-c.viii.4, x.13,18.
<i>adha</i> yā <i>i</i> , xii.7.	<i>anupapatti</i> , c.iv.23, xiv.4.	<i>andhah</i> , xi.10.
<i>adhi</i> , i.15.	<i>anupapanna</i> , c.i.21,59, iv.23 (-tā). v.26,35, viii.18, xvii.2.	<i>annāya</i> , xii.7.
<i>adhi</i> ka, xvii.5:-c.ii.11,25,28, xvi.19, xvii.1: and <i>ādhikāya</i> .	<i>anupalabdhī</i> , xxiii.7.	<i>anneshu</i> , xi.17.
<i>adhitāraṇa</i> , c.i.59.	<i>anupradāna</i> , ii.8, xxiii.2:-c.ii.9,10.	<i>anya</i> , ii.11,33, xxii.14:-c.i.19, ii.2,19, ix.1, xiv.5, xv.9.
<i>adhikāra</i> , c.i.2, ii.1, iii.1, iv.1,8, etc.	<i>anurodhā</i> , c.i.2, xiv.5,28, xx.12.	<i>anyatātah</i> , xix.1.
<i>adhikāraka</i> , xxii.6:-c.xx.3.	<i>anuvartana</i> , c.ix.9, x.14, xiii.16.	<i>anyatārastha</i> , c.xiv.5
<i>adhigama</i> , c.i.1.	<i>anuvaka</i> , c.i.61, iii.9, iv.25, 26,48,52, ix.20, xi.3, xvii.60, xviii.3v.	<i>anyathā</i> , c.i.42 etc.
<i>adhishavāne</i> , iv.11.	<i>anuvṛtti</i> , c.iv.40, viii.23, xvi.13.	<i>anyādhihīh</i> , vii.16.
<i>adhi</i> i, iii.7.	<i>anusādra</i> , c.i.21,57,59, iv.52.	<i>anyoyārvaya</i> , c.i.49, ii.7.
<i>adhyayana</i> , c.i.1. xiv.4,5,28.	<i>anusārīvā</i> , c.xiii.16.	<i>anvaya</i> , c.i.1, xiv.15, xvi.23: and <i>anyonyānv-</i> , <i>paras-</i> <i>parāv-</i> .
<i>adhyardha</i> , ii.28:-c.ii.25,28, xi.19, xxii.1.	<i>anusārīvin</i> , c.xiii.16.	<i>anvartha</i> , c.i.3.
<i>adhyāya</i> , c.i.61, x.15, xii.1, xiii.3,15, xiv.4, xix.5, xxiv.2, and endings of chapters.	<i>anusāvāra</i> , i.18,34, ii.19,30, xv.3, xvii.1,3, xxii.6, xxii.15:-c.i.1,60, ii.25,33, viii.15, xvii.2,25,17,15-23,25-31, xvii.5.	<i>anvavasarga</i> , xxii.10.
<i>adhyetār</i> , c.ii.34, xvii.8, xxiv.5.	<i>anu</i> , iii.7.	<i>anvākarshaka</i> , c.i.84, x.17.
<i>adhvāra</i> , xii.18.	<i>anukāra</i> , iv.52.	<i>anvācaya</i> , c.xii.14, xx.10.
<i>adhvaram</i> <i>vīṣvatah</i> , viii.32.	<i>anushānavat</i> , iii.15.	<i>anvādeśa</i> , i.58:-c.viii.16, vi.3, vii.3,6, viii.12, ix.22, xi.4,6,11, xii.6, xiv.4, xxii.5.
<i>adhvāyo</i> , xii.8.	<i>anu</i> , iii.7.	<i>anvīdeśaka</i> , xxii.5:-c.i.52, ii.13,18, v.30, vi.3, xi.4, xiv.6,8,20, xv.4, xvi.3.
<i>anadvān</i> , v.21.	<i>anukāra</i> , iv.52.	<i>apāra</i> , c.i.21, xi.1, xv.7,9.
<i>anadātā</i> , iii.12.	<i>anushānavat</i> , iii.15.	<i>aparā</i> , c.i.12.
<i>anadhiṣṭata</i> , c.vii.15.	<i>anu</i> , iii.7.	<i>parigraha</i> , c.xvi.29.
<i>anantah</i> , viii.8.	<i>anu</i> , iii.7.	<i>apuvādu</i> , c.i.13, iv.2, vi.5, viii.4, xii.8, xvi.11.
<i>anantara</i> , i.41,44,xxiii.16:-c.i.1, ii.1, iii.1 etc., iv.53, x.12, xvii.13.	<i>anu</i> , iii.7.	<i>apuvādaka</i> , c.xiv.5,6.
<i>anantodātta</i> , xvi.5.	<i>anukāra</i> , iv.52.	<i>apazū</i> , c.i.14.
<i>anapeksha</i> , c.xiv.18.	<i>anu</i> , iii.7.	<i>apasah</i> , viii.24.
<i>anamīvāh</i> , xi.17.	<i>anu</i> , iii.7.	<i>apād</i> , iii.12.
<i>anarthā</i> , c.ix.23.	<i>anu</i> , iii.7.	<i>apāni napāti</i> , xi.8.
<i>anarthaka</i> , c.iv.23, viii.13, ix.8,23v, xiv.15, xxi.5.	<i>anekā</i> , i.26.	<i>api</i> , i.26,43,51,52, iv.4,51, vii.5, viii.12, xiii.7, xiv.30, xv.8, xvi.3,15, xx.3, xxii.5,14, xxiv.4.
<i>anavagraha</i> , c.viii.8,10,12-4.	<i>anta</i> , i.55 (-vat), ii.17,40,43, 48, iv.3, vii.16, xii.15, xv.5, xxii.14,15, xxiii.15:-c.i.21 etc.: and <i>īhgyānta</i> .	" <i>pi dadhāmi</i> , xii.7.
<i>anavasthā</i> , c.xiv.22.	<i>anta</i> , i.55 (-vat), ii.17,40,43, 48, iv.3, vii.16, xii.15, xv.5, xxii.14,15, xxiii.15:-c.i.21 etc.: and <i>īhgyānta</i> .	<i>apidhāna</i> , c.viii.3.
<i>anādeśa</i> , ii.20:-c.ii.21.	<i>antah</i> , viii.10,32.	<i>apūpam</i> , xii.7.
<i>anādyudātta</i> , viii.10.	<i>antahpūtitva</i> , c.iv.23, viii.18, xii.3.	<i>opūrva</i> , xx.2.
-anān, vii.14.	<i>antatah</i> , c.xix.3.	<i>aprīta</i> , i.54, ix.16:-c.x.17.
<i>anāmīkā</i> , c.xxiii.17.	<i>antamah</i> , xi.13.	<i>apekshā</i> , c.ii.35, iv.2, ix.22
<i>anārsha</i> , c.ix.22.	<i>antara</i> , v.40, ix.16, xxiii.17:-c.x.3 etc.: and <i>anant-</i>	(-kshatva), xiv.18, xv.9, xxii.5,11: and <i>anap-</i> , <i>nir-</i>
<i>anihgyānta</i> , viii.13:-c.viii.8.	<i>ekānt-</i> .	<i>ap-</i> , <i>sāp-</i> .
<i>anitya</i> , c.vi.14.		<i>apy etu</i> , ix.22.
<i>anishta</i> , c.ii.21, ii.20, iv.23, v.3,31, ix.6, x.11, xii.3, xiv.22, xvi.29.		<i>apragraha</i> , xv.6.
<i>anishtātak</i> , xi.4.		
<i>ani</i> , vii.12.		
<i>anu</i> , xi.5,7.		

ākāra, iv.40, ix.20, xvi.14.	āyañ, v.21.	<i>id agne</i> , v.17.
16 ( <i>and</i> -).	āyāma, xxii.9.	<i>idam</i> etc., i.46, ii.51.
ākhyā, i.16, 27:-ci.16, 17, 19-	āyuñ, vi.5, 13.	<i>id u</i> , v.17.
23, 27, 28.	āyo, xii.8.	<i>idānim</i> , ci.43, ix.11
āgama, i.23, xxiv.5:-ci.24,	ār, x.9.	<i>indra</i> , vii.2.
53, 60, v.4-8, 32, 33, 40, 41,	ārambha, ci.60, ii.20, 23, v.	<i>indrāh</i> , vii.8, xi.9.
ix.16, xiv.5-11, 23, xv.3-	10, 41, vi.3, viii.8, 16, 24,	<i>indrā</i> , iii.3.
5, xvii.2-31, xxi.12.	ix.13, 21, x.22, xii.1, 6,	<i>indriya</i> , cxxi.15 (- <i>vishaya</i> ).
Āgniveya, see p. 430.	xiii.10, xiv.22, 24, xvi.4, 6,	<i>indriyā</i> , iii.5.
Āgniveyāyana, see p. 430.	18, xx.10, xxi.1.	<i>indro me</i> , ix.22.
āñ, ci.1, 15, iv.23.	ārambhana, c.v.1, xiv.3.	<i>imāñ nah</i> , v.17.
ā ca, ix.22.	ārithā, iii.10.	<i>ime</i> , iv.24.
ādārya, xxiv.6:-ci.47, ix.4,	āropañjana, cxiv.9, 9 (- <i>tva</i> ).	<i>iyam eva sa d yā</i> , xi.3.
x.21, 22, xiv.4, xv.8, xviii.	ārthika, ci.59.	<i>irāvati</i> , iv.22.
1, 3, xxiii.18; and see p.	ārdhnuvan, v.21.	<i>īva</i> , xvii.8.
430.	ārsha, ix.21, x.13:-ci.23,	<i>īvara</i> , ii.22, x.4, 15, xx.1.
ātinārah, xiii.12.	xxiv.2.	r. <i>ish</i> , <i>ich</i> , c.v.1, viii.15:
ātāñsīt, xvi.13.	āv, ix.15.	+ <i>abhi</i> , ci.9: and <i>ishta</i> ,
āti, xiv.8.	āvah, viii.9.	<i>ishti</i> .
ātmaka, c.xiv.28, xxii.1.	āvih, viii.24.	<i>ishta</i> , ci.46, v.37, 41, viii.
Ātreya, c.intr., v.1; and see	āvinnak, xi.15.	22, x.21, xiv.3, 9, 13, 26, 33,
p. 430.	āvṛt, viii.11.	xv.2, 7, 9, xvi.16, 24, xvii.
ādi, i.41, 46, 52, 53, 55, ii.26,	āvṛtā, ci.61.v.	7, xviii.5, 7, xix.3: and
47, iii.1, xvi.29, xxii.4,	āfīh, vi.10.	<i>ani</i> .
xxiii.15; (=etc.), v.40,	āgraya, cxxiv.2.	<i>ishtak</i> , iv.44.
xxiii.11, xxiv.4.	āgrayana, c.i.1.	<i>ishtā</i> , iii.6.
ādīta, i.2, 5:-ci.47, xxiii.	āgrayatva, c.i.1, viii.18.	<i>ishtī</i> , iv.52.
10.	r. <i>ds</i> : + <i>adhi</i> , c.xiv.4.	<i>īhā</i> , ix.22.
ādeça, ci.52, iii.8, ix.7, x.19,	āsate ye, xi.16.	<i>īkāra</i> , iv.8, ix.20, xvi.14.
xiii.16: and <i>anād</i> .	āsanna, i.25.	r. <i>iksh</i> : + <i>vi</i> , c.intr.; + <i>apa</i> ,
ādeçaka, ci.33.	āstām, iv.52.	c.v.24 ( <i>anupekshya</i> ): and
ādyā, i.7.	āhuti, iii.7, iv.15.	<i>apekshā</i> .
ādyudātta, vi.14:-ci. viii.8:	āhvāraka, xxiii.14.	<i>īdencyān</i> , ix.22.
and <i>anād</i> .	r. <i>i</i> : + <i>adhi</i> , xxiv.5:-ci. xviii.	<i>īm</i> , v.12.
ādhikya, cxxiv.3.	7, xxiv.6v; + <i>prati</i> , ci.30.	<i>īyuh</i> , vi.5.
ān, iii.15.	42, ii.41, iv.11, v.7, xviii.	r. <i>ir</i> : + <i>sam</i> , ci.2.
ān māhī, iv.34.	1, xix.3, xx.10, xxiii.16:	<i>īrayathā</i> , iii.10.
ānantarya, ci.1, ii.1.	and <i>adhyayana</i> , <i>adhyetar</i> ,	<i>īshat</i> , ii.15.
ānukūlyā, ci.46.	vyaveta, etc.	<i>ī</i> .
ānunāsikya, ii.52, xvii.1:-	īkāra, ii.28.	u, xxii.14.
c.xvii.3, 4; and <i>sāñ</i> .	r. <i>īhg</i> : + <i>ut</i> , xvii.8.	u, vi.2.
ānupada, cxxiv.6.	īngya, i.48:-ci.49, iii.8, iv.	<i>uktā</i> , ii.29, viii.21, ix.16,
ānupūrvya, i.1, 10; ii.44, xxi.	10.	x.15, 22, xx.1.
12, xxii.13:-ci.1, xvii.4.	īngyānta, iv.10, viii.13 ( <i>an</i> ):	<i>uktā</i> , i.61, xxiii.19:-ci. iv.23
ānumānika, c.i.9.	-ci. viii.13, 13 (- <i>tva</i> ).	(- <i>tva</i> ).
r. <i>āp</i> , c.viii.11-15, ix.17, x.	īdāh, viii.24.	<i>uktī</i> , ci.61, ii.23, iii.7, viii.
2, 4-8, 10, 11, xii.7, 8, xiv.	īdāvān, ix.21.	13, x.9, 12.
3, 21; + <i>pra</i> , ii.32, 34, 35,	ītaratra, c.viii.14.	<i>uktīd</i> , iii.2.
ix.13, x.13, xi.4, xii.16,	ītarathā, c.v.12.	<i>uktīhatā</i> , iii.10.
xvi.29: and <i>prāpāna</i> ,	iti, i.15, 29, 30, 46, 47, ii.3, iii.	<i>ūkhya</i> , ix.20, xi.3:-ci.61,
<i>prāpta</i> , <i>prāpti</i> , <i>ativyāpti</i> ,	7, iv.3, 10, vi.10, 15, 31, xiii.	ix.23 (- <i>tva</i> ).
āpāh, iv.25, xi.5, 8.	4, 14, vi.19, 33, xvi.12, 30,	<i>Ukhya</i> , see p. 430.
āpatti, ci.37, 51, v.24, 31, 35,	xvii.1-4, 7, 8, xviii.2, xx.2,	<i>ugāñā</i> , xiii.12.
viii.13, xiii.3, xiv.12.	8, xxii.5-10, 13, xxiii.2,	r. <i>uc</i> : <i>ucita</i> , c.xvii.7.
āpādaka, c.v.35.	16, 19, 20, xxiv.2, 3, 6.	<i>uccā</i> , i.38 ( <i>uccāh</i> ), xxiii.20:-
ā pūshā, x.13.	itipara, iv.4, viii.12, ix.20	ci.18, xviii.4, xx.2.
-ā pr̄shati, iv.15.	( <i>an</i> ):-ci.15 (- <i>tva</i> ), ix.2	<i>uccā</i> , v.8.
āpo hi, vi.2.	( <i>an</i> ), 21 (- <i>tva</i> ), 23 (do).	<i>uccārāna</i> , ci.1, iv.11, x.23,
ābhāsatā, ci.25	itivat, ci.7 etc.	xvi.13, xxi.5, xxii.9: and
ābhīh, vi.5.	ītham, ci.2.	<i>anu</i> .
āy, ix.14.	īty evam, v.18.	<i>uccāihkara</i> , xxii.9.
āy ajishṭhāh, ix.22		

<i>āirayan</i> , v.21.	<i>karenu</i> , cxxi.15.	<i>kṛṇudhvān sadane</i> , iv. 11.
<i>okāra</i> , ii.13, iv.6, ix.7,12, x. 5,7,22, xi.1. xviii.1.	<i>karō</i> , viii.30.	<i>kṛṇvan</i> , vi.14.
<i>oṁkara</i> , c.i.1.	<i>karpa</i> , c iv.52, xxiii.17 (-mūliya).	<i>kṛdhi</i> , viii.26.
<i>otva</i> , c.i.51, viii.8,16,19,21, ix.7,8, xi.5, xvi.29.	<i>kartṛtva</i> , c ii.2.	<i>kṛdhi suvah</i> , vii.2.
<i>od man</i> , x.14.	<i>karmatva</i> , c ii.2.	<i>kṛdhi</i> , iii.13.
<i>one</i> , vii.10.	<i>karmadharaya</i> , cx.6.	<i>kṛṣamadhyā</i> , cxxiv.6.
<i>osha dhī</i> , iii.7.	<i>kurman</i> , cxxi.14, xxii.3.	<i>kṛṣṭa</i> , xxiii.12,14.
<i>osha dhīh</i> , v.17.	<i>karuṇi</i> , cxxi.15.	<i>kṛṣṇāṅghri</i> , cxxiv.6.
<i>oshiḥha</i> , ii.12 (-hanu), 14,21, 24,39:-c ii.25, xxiii.2:	r. <i>karsh</i> : + <i>anu</i> , cii.51, viii. 34, xxiii.18; + ā, cii.22,43, ii.17, vii.6,7, viii.4,15, ix. 4,20, etc.; + <i>saṁni</i> , cii.15, 24,27, iv.23, xi.3: and <i>kṛṣṭa</i> , <i>unkarshana</i> , <i>an-</i> <i>vākarshaka</i> , <i>dkarshaka</i> , <i>saṁnikarsha</i> .	<i>kena</i> , vii.8.
<i>oshiḥha</i> , x.14.	r. <i>kalp</i> , xiv.28; + <i>vi</i> , ci.21.	<i>kevala</i> , ci.18,43,59, ii.47, xiv.33, xxii.1,2, xxiv.4.
<i>oshiḥhānta</i> , ii.43.	<i>kalpayanti</i> , iv.15.	<i>kāivalya</i> , c xx.12v.
<i>oshiḥhya</i> , cii.25.	<i>kalyāñjī</i> , xviii.12.	<i>komala</i> , cxx.12.
<i>aukāra</i> , ii.26, ix.15, x.7.	<i>kavarga</i> , ii.35:-c ii.44.	<i>kāuṇeyah</i> , xiii.12.
<i>ka</i> ( <i>k</i> ), viii.23, ix.4.	<i>Kaçyapa</i> , cxxiv.6 (-goṭra).	<i>Kāundinya</i> , see p. 430.
<i>ka</i> (pron.), xviii.2 ( <i>cit</i> ); <i>ke-</i> <i>cit</i> , ci.57, viii.15, xi.1,3,9, xii.3, xiii.13, xiv.4,5,11, 15, xv.9, xvi.2,12, xxiii.17.	<i>Kāñikshi</i> , cix.21 (-vat).	<i>Kāuhaleya</i> , see p. 430.
<i>kah</i> , viii.9.	<i>kāṇa</i> , xiii.9.	<i>kra</i> , viii.26.
<i>akāra</i> , v.32, viii.31.	<i>kānda</i> , c i.61, iii.9, ix.20.	<i>krañṣaye</i> , xvi.22.
<i>kakut</i> , viii.4.	<i>Kāñdamāyana</i> , see p. 430.	<i>krato</i> , xii.8.
<i>kakhevān</i> , ix.21.	<i>kāmacāra</i> , c ii.7.	r. <i>kram</i> : + <i>ati</i> , c iv.23, xvii. 8, xxiv.4; + <i>pra</i> , c x.15.
<i>kaṭhinatā</i> , cxxi.9.	<i>kāra</i> , i.16, xxii.4.	<i>krama</i> , xxii.16, xxiii.20, xxiv.5,6:-c ii.9, xxiii.16, xxiv.2.
<i>kaṇṭha</i> , ii.2,3,4,46, xxiii.10: -c ii.47, xxii.10, xxii.2, 17v (-mūliya).	<i>kārana</i> , c ii.1, xvi.26, xxiii. 3,19.	<i>krayi</i> , iii.13.
<i>kanthokta</i> , c i.59,59 (-tva).	<i>kārya</i> , ci.55,60 ( <i>sva</i> ), ii.13, iv.3,7,11, v.1, viii.13,15, ix.7,24 ( <i>sva</i> ), xiv.5, xvi. 2, xix.5 ( <i>anu</i> ), xxiv.2.	<i>kriyā</i> , cxxiv.4.
iii.8, iv.41.	<i>kāryabhdj</i> , c i.25,55,58,61, iii.1, iv.23 (-tva), xix.4 ( <i>anu</i> ).	r. <i>kruc</i> , c vi.9.
<i>kanthokti</i> , ci.14,59, vi.3,5, viii.16.	<i>kārshni</i> , iv.12.	<i>krushṭa</i> , cxxiii.12-4v.
<i>kanva</i> , xiii.9.	<i>kāla</i> , i.33 ( <i>samāna</i> ), 37, xvii. 5:-c i.1,35,36, vi.4, x.12, xi.19, xxii.1, xxii.13, xxiii. 2, xxiv.5,6: and <i>padak-</i>	<i>krurām</i> , iv.25.
r. <i>kath</i> , ci.11,53, ii.33,47, v. 28, xi.3, xv.9, xviii.3, xxiii.17.	<i>Kālāñjaya</i> , c xviii.1.	<i>kvacit</i> , c xiv.28, xxi.6, etc.
<i>kathana</i> , c iv.23, v.26, xx.7, xxiii.17.	<i>kiñcila</i> , kiñgilā, xvi.26.	<i>ksha</i> ( <i>ksh</i> ), ix.3.
<i>kanishthikā</i> , cxxiii.17.	<i>kiñca</i> , ci.21, ii.47, iv.23, v. 22, etc.	<i>kshāmā</i> , iii.10.
<i>kaninike</i> , iv.11.	<i>kiñtu</i> , ci.21,53,61, ii.18,23- 5, iv.23, vii.15, viii.13, ix. 7, etc.	r. <i>kship</i> : + <i>adhi</i> , c xv.9; + <i>ni</i> , c ii.18; + <i>pra</i> , c xiv.11.
<i>kaniyād</i> , xvi.13.	<i>ku</i> (= <i>kavarga</i> ), ci.47: r. <i>kshira</i> , c xvii.8, xxi.1.	<i>kshāipra</i> , xx.1,9:-c xx.8.
<i>kapalān</i> , vi.14.	r. <i>kuc</i> : + <i>sam</i> , ci.15.	
<i>kam u</i> , vi.2.	<i>kuṇapam</i> , xiii.12.	<i>khī</i> , xiv.8.
r. <i>kamp</i> : + <i>pra</i> , c xix.3.	<i>kundala</i> , -lin, c iv.52.	r. <i>khyā</i> : + ā, c ix.20, xx.8;
<i>kampa</i> , cxix.3,5.	<i>kutoh</i> , ci.18,21, ii.23, v.22. etc.	+ <i>vyā</i> , c xiii.16, xiv.5,
r. <i>kar</i> , ii.4:-c i.61, v.3,35, etc.; <i>kāra</i> , c ii.14 etc.; <i>karaniya</i> , c xlii.12; + <i>adhi-</i> <i>dhi</i> , c i.1, viii.5, xii.9, xiv. 14, xxii.6; <i>adhikrtā</i> , c ii.1, iv.1, etc.: and <i>adhi-</i> <i>kāra</i> etc., <i>kārya</i> , <i>anadhi-</i> <i>kṛtātva</i> , <i>prakṛta</i> , <i>vikṛta</i> etc., <i>vākṛta</i> .	<i>kutastha</i> , c v.2.	xxii.3: and <i>ākhyā</i> , <i>vyā-</i> <i>khyāna</i> , <i>samīkhyā</i> etc.
<i>karana</i> , ii.27,32,34,45, xxiii.2,6 (-vat):-c ii.20 etc., xxiii.2, xxiv.5.	r. <i>kṛṇutā</i> , iii.10.	r. <i>gakāra</i> , c xiv.23.
		r. <i>gan</i> , c xvii.6v.
		<i>gaṇa</i> , xiii.9.
		r. <i>gad</i> : + <i>ni</i> , ci.60.
		r. <i>gam</i> , i.50, xxiv.6:-c i.33, xiv.3,4v; + <i>ava</i> , ci.33v, 51, xx.7; + <i>upa</i> , c xvii.3; + <i>sam</i> , c v.1: and <i>adhi-</i> <i>gama</i> .
		<i>gamanikā</i> , ci.18, viii.16.
		<i>gamayatah</i> , iv.52.
		r. <i>gar</i> : + <i>sam</i> , ci.21, xi.1.

<i>ta (t)</i> , v.33, vii.13, xiii.15.	<i>tishthā</i> , iii.12.	<i>da dhāsi</i> , xvii.18.
<i>tatva</i> , c.21.	<i>tivravata</i> , xvii.1, 4:-c xvi.24,	<i>danta</i> , ii.43:-c ii.18 ( <i>pākti</i> ).
<i>tavarga</i> , ii.37, xiii.11, xiv.	xvii.2, 3 (- <i>tva</i> ).	<i>dantamūla</i> , ii.38, 41, 42.
20:-c ii.44, xiv.28.	<i>tu</i> , i.19, 59, ii.14, 25, 29, 33, 45,	r. <i>dar</i> : + <i>d</i> , c ix.21, xiii.16.
<i>tavargiya</i> , c xiii.14.	iv.40, viii.16. ix.9, x.19,	<i>darvi</i> , iv.12.
<i>tha (th)</i> , vii.14.	21, xi.1, xiv.5, 11, xv.3, 8,	r. <i>dar</i> , c i.1, ii.2, 5, iv.11,
<i>da (d)</i> , xiii.16.	xviii.1, xx.2, xxii.6, xxiv.	viii.16, ix.22, x.10, xiv.5,
<i>ḍakāra</i> , c iv.38.	5.	28.
<i>na (n)</i> , xxii.14.	<i>tu</i> , iv.42, v.13.	<i>darçana</i> , c i.59, ii.1, iii.1
<i>nakāra</i> , vii.1, xiii.6.	<i>tulya</i> , c i.33, ii.19 (- <i>tva</i> ), xiv.	(ad-), xii.9 (ad-), xii.3
<i>natva</i> , c i.51, 60, v.3, vii.2	23.	(ad-), xiv.5, 15, xv.9v, xvi.
etc., xiii.7 etc.	<i>tū</i> , iii.14.	26.
<i>nic</i> , c ii.17.	<i>tūnave</i> , xiii.12.	r. <i>dā</i> : + <i>anupra</i> , c ii.8; + <i>u-</i>
<i>ta (t)</i> , vii.13.	<i>tushnim</i> , c ii.20 (- <i>bhāva</i> ,	<i>pā</i> , c ii.7, 8: and <i>anupra-</i>
<i>ta (pron.)</i> , i.33, 41, 49, ii.3, 7,	- <i>bhūta</i> ), xxii.6 (- <i>bhāva</i> ).	<i>dādāna</i> , <i>upādāna</i> .
31-4, v.27, 38, ix.2, xii.9,	<i>tr</i> , xvi.27.	<i>dādhāra</i> , iv.22.
xiv.9, xix.3, 4, xx.4, xxi.2,	<i>trānne</i> , iv.11.	<i>dārupya</i> , xxii.9.
13, xxii.2, xxiii.13, 16-9.	<i>triya</i> , i.11, viii.3, xxiii.12,	<i>dārdhyā</i> , cxvii.1.
<i>takāra</i> , v.22, 33, vi.5, 14, vii.	16:-c i.61 (- <i>tva</i> ), xxiii.10	<i>dārvā</i> , xvi.13.
15.	(- <i>savana</i> ).	<i>divah</i> , viii.24, 28.
<i>tat</i> , ix.17.	<i>tradye</i> , iv.11.	<i>divi</i> , vi.2.
<i>tatah</i> , xv.3, xxii.14.	<i>te</i> , iv.40, 42, xi.10.	r. <i>dīc</i> : + <i>d</i> , c xx.4v; + <i>anvd</i> ,
<i>tatra</i> , v.3, xxii.3, 12.	<i>te asya</i> , iv.20.	c i.26, 32, 51, 55, 60, ii.19,
<i>tatrā</i> , iii.8	<i>te acaranti</i> , iv.20.	etc.; + <i>ut</i> , c iv.2, 52, x.11:
<i>tathā</i> , xxii.14.	<i>Tāittirīya</i> , xxiii.16, 15 (- <i>ka</i> ).	+ <i>upa</i> , xxii.18:-c i.1, 60,
<i>tathātva</i> , c i.43, ii.20.	<i>tāirovyanjana</i> , xx.7, 12:-	xvii.1, xxii.6, 17; + <i>nih</i> ,
<i>taddnim</i> , c i.21.	c xvii.29, xx.8.	c i.29, ii.7, 23, x.23, xiii.
<i>taddhīta</i> , c xiii.9.	<i>trapu</i> , v.4.	9v, xxiii.17. xxiv.5; + <i>pra-</i>
<i>tanuvāu</i> , iv.44.	<i>tri</i> , i.20, xxiii.11, 14.	<i>tatiñ</i> , c ii.7: and <i>anvade-</i>
<i>tanūyat</i> , iv.52.	<i>tri</i> , vii.2, xvi.25.	<i>ca</i> , - <i>ca</i> , <i>ādeca</i> , - <i>ca</i> ,
<i>tanu</i> , c ii.7.	<i>trih</i> , i.36.	<i>nirdeca</i> , - <i>ca</i> .
<i>tapata</i> , iii.12.	<i>tripadaprabṛti</i> , i.61:-c i.	r. <i>dih</i> : + <i>sam</i> , c xiv.4.
<i>tapasah</i> , xii.8.	59, 61 (- <i>tva</i> ), xi.9, 18:	<i>didivā</i> , xvi.13.
<i>tapasi</i> , iv.17.	<i>Tribhāshyaratna</i> , c intr. and	<i>dipa</i> , c xviii.3, xx.12 (- <i>vat</i> ).
<i>tamasah</i> , viii.24.	endings of chapters.	<i>dṛptija</i> , xxii.13..
r. <i>tar</i> : + <i>ava</i> , c ii.9.	<i>trimātra</i> , xxii.13.	<i>dīyā</i> , iii.12.
<i>tarata</i> , iii.12.	<i>trirūpa</i> , c i.36.	<i>dirgha</i> , i.3, 35, viii.17, x.2,
<i>tarā</i> , iii.8.	<i>tri</i> , vi.2.	xxii.14, xxiv.5:-c ii.24,
<i>tarhān</i> , vii.14.	<i>trin</i> , vi.14.	iii.1, v.12, etc.: and <i>dair-</i>
<i>tarhi</i> , c i.15, 21, ii.25, iii.8,	<i>trividhya</i> , c ii.3.	<i>ghya</i> .
etc.	<i>tvah</i> , xi.5.	<i>dirghad</i> , iii.5.
<i>tavarga</i> , ii.38, xiv.20, 21:-	<i>tvām tarā</i> , iii.8.	<i>duḥkliṣṭha</i> , c xiii.16.
c ii.44.	<i>r. tvar</i> : <i>atavaritam</i> , c xxiii.	<i>dundubhi</i> , c xxiii.3.
<i>tavargiya</i> , xiii.15.	20.	<i>durbala</i> , cxvi.19, xxi.1.
<i>tasthivā</i> , xvi.13.	<i>tvashṭah</i> , viii.8.	<i>durvyan</i> , ix.21.
<i>tasmat</i> , ix.17.	<i>tvā</i> , iii.5.	<i>dr̥t</i> , xvi.27.
<i>tasmin</i> , vi.14.	<i>tvish</i> , iii.7.	<i>dr̥dhā</i> , xvii.6, xx.9 (- <i>tara</i> ):
<i>tātparya</i> , c i.15, 24, 35, 36.	<i>tha (th)</i> , iv.7, vii.14.	-c xix.5, xx.10.
<i>tān</i> , vi.14.	<i>the</i> , iv.40.	<i>dr̥hay</i> , c xxiii.19.
<i>tābhām eva</i> , iv.52.	<i>da (d)</i> , iv.7.	<i>dr̥dhe</i> , iv.27.
<i>tāmra</i> , c xxiv.6.	<i>dañçukā</i> , <i>dañshtrā</i> ,	<i>dr̥śhānta</i> , c xiii.15.
<i>tāra</i> , xxii.11, xiii.5, 10.	<i>bhyām</i> , <i>dañsam</i> , <i>dañ-</i>	<i>deva rishah</i> , viii.24.
<i>tālu</i> , ii.22, 36, 40.	<i>sanābhayah</i> , <i>dañso-</i>	<i>devatā phalguni</i> , iv.12.
<i>tāvant</i> , i.35:-c i.1, 41, 56, ii.3,	<i>bhih</i> , xvi.19.	<i>devate</i> , iv.11.
25, viii.16.	<i>dukāra</i> , v.8.	<i>Devadatta</i> , c i.14, iv.52.
<i>tishthān</i> , vi.14.	<i>dakshinenā</i> , iii.10.	<i>devā</i> , iii.2.
<i>tishthantyekayā</i> , v.19.	<i>datte</i> , xi.5.	<i>devān</i> , vi.14.
	<i>dadāsi</i> , xvi.18.	<i>Devipurāṇa</i> , c xxiv.6.
	<i>dadāsi</i> , xvi.18.	<i>deca</i> , i.59:-c i.29, ii.17, viii.
	<i>dadāsi</i> , xvi.18.	21, xix.3.
	<i>dadāsi</i> , xvi.18.	<i>deha</i> , c vi.9.
	<i>dadāsi</i> , xvi.18.	<i>dairghya</i> , c xxii.9.

- nicāstara, i.44.  
*nu*, v.13.  
*nudd*, iii.8.  
*nū*, iii.14.  
*nūnam*, vii.16.  
*nr.*, vii.9.  
*nṛtyanti*, vii.16.  
*nemī devān*, vi.14.  
*neshtah*, viii.8.  
*nāmittika*, c ix.22, xiv.28v.  
*nairuntarya*, c xix.3.  
*nyāya*, ci.59, ii.17, 25, 51v,  
 iv.23, 51. v.35, viii.16, xl.  
 18, xiii.15, xiv.4, xvi.19.  
*nyāyya*, cxiv.5.  
*nyāna*, cint., i.42 (-*tva*),  
 ii.23, 23 (-*tva*), xxiii.20.  
*nvatī*, iv.29.
- pa* (*p*), iv.28, 30.  
*pakāra*, v.36, viii.23.  
*paksha*, civ.23, 40, v.30, viii.  
 13, ix.6, x.20, xiv.10, 11,  
 17, xv.3, xviii.5, 7.  
*panka*, civ.23, xiv.4.  
*pankti*, ci.18.  
*pañcān*, i.10.  
*pañcama*, xxiii.2:-c xi.14  
 (-*mi*).  
*pañcavīñcati*, i.7.  
*pata*, ci.ii.7, v.28.  
*r. path*, ci.51, v.1, 2, ix.20,  
 xxiv.3, 5.  
*pani*, *panim*, xiii.10.  
*paneta*, xiii.12.  
*patañgān*, ix.23.  
*Patañjali*, cxxi.1.  
*pataye*, *patih*, *patim*,  
 viii.27.  
*patir nah*. xi.16.  
*pati*, iv.35, viii.27.  
*pate*, viii.27, xii.8.  
*patni*, vi.7.  
*patni ve*, viii.27.  
*pathē*, viii.25.  
*r. pad*: +*d*, ci.ii.1-15. v.9,  
 10, 20-25, 34-7, vi.1-14,  
 etc.; *apanna*, ci.51, v.35,  
 x.10, xvi.3, 15; *apād*, ci.ii.  
 7, xxi.6; +*ut*, c vii.15; +  
*upa*, ci.1. ii.47, iv.3, 52, v.  
 1, 35, viii.18, xiv.28, xvi.  
 19; +*nih*, c xiv.5; +*pra-*  
*ti*, c vi.13, viii.15; +*sam*,  
 xxiii.20: and *anupapan-*  
*na*, *apatti*, *apādaka*, *upat-*  
*ti*, *upapatti*, *nispādya*,  
*pratipati*.  
*pad*, iv.44.  
*pada*, i.50, 54, vi.4, viii.9,  
 xv.7, xvi.17, xx.2, 6, xxii.  
 13 (-*vīrāma*): -c v.1, 2, 3,
- 10, 12, vi.8, viii.33, ix.1, *paribhāshā*, c iv.52.  
 xiv.5, xx.2, xxiv.6, etc.; *parimāṇa*, xxiii.2:-ci.37.  
 and *ekap*, *nānip*, *prakti*-*parisamāpti*, ci.61.  
*tip*, *samīnap*.  
*padakāla*, ci.60. vi.4, viii.9,  
 xv.7, xx.2, 4v.  
*padakrama*, xxiv.6.  
*padagrahaṇa*, i.50:-ci.51-3.  
 iv.11, v.12, ix.22.  
*padapāṭha*, ci.v.5, v.2.  
*padasavīhitā*, xxiv.2 3:-  
 c xiii.5, 14, xxiv.4.  
*padasamaya*, c vi.14.  
*padodī*, xvi.2 8:-c iii.1, 15,  
 etc.  
*padainta*, xiv.28, xvi.14:-  
 ci.ii.1, iv.3 (*ap*), 5, ix.11-  
 15 etc. xiii.13 (-*tva*).  
*padūrtha*, c xiii.14.  
*padī*, vi.2.  
*padākadeṣa*, ci.23, 50, iv.35.  
 54, vi.10, 12, vii.6, 11, viii.  
 28, 29, xi.15, 17, xii.6, xiii.  
 14, xv.26, 29.  
*padhati*, cxiv.4.  
*papi vā*, xvi.18.  
*payuh*, xvii.8.  
*payasvān*, ix.21.  
*para*, i.8, 9, 30, iv.18, 45, 47,  
 50, v.7, 10, x.16, 25, xiii.  
 16, xiv.4, 9, 22, 29, xvi.19,  
 xxi.5, 9; -*para*, iii.1, 3, 4,  
 iv.4, 6, 24, 28, 30, 32, 33, 37,  
 38, 42, 44, 46, 52, v.4-6, 8,  
 14, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25-30,  
 32, 37, vi.5, 14, vii.15, viii.  
 2-4, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 23, 25-  
 31, 34, ix.1-5, 7, 8, 10, 13,  
 20, 22, 24, x.2-4, 8, 13, 14,  
 22, xi.9, 15, 18, xii.4, 5, xiii.  
 2-4, 11, 15, xiv.1, 9, 11-13,  
 16, 17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-8,  
 31, xv.4, xvi.1, 2, 10, 14, 27,  
 xix.3, xxi.7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16,  
 xxi.15; -*para*, xxi.2.  
*paratal*, c v.24, viii.6, x.10,  
 11, xx.3.  
*paratra*, c viii.33.  
*paratava*, ci.15, 30.  
*paranipāta*, ci.ii.2.  
*paranīmitta*, civ.7.25, v.24.  
 viii.6, 23, xiv.5, xvi.14v.  
*parabhuṭa*, c viii.33. xx.4.  
*parama*, xiv.8.  
*paraspara*, ci.3, v.2 (-*rin-*  
*vaya*), xv.6 (do.).  
*parāmarśin*, ci.ii.7.  
*parī*, l.15.  
*parī*, vii.4. viii.28.  
*parī vā*, viii.34.  
*parikalpanā*, c xviii.7v.  
*parigraha* in ap.-
- 10, 12, vi.8, viii.33, ix.1, *paribhāshā*, c iv.52.  
 xiv.5, xx.2, xxiv.6, etc.; *parimāṇa*, xxiii.2:-ci.37.  
 and *ekap*, *nānip*, *prakti*-*parisamāpti*, ci.61.  
*tip*, *samīnap*.  
*padakāla*, ci.60. vi.4, viii.9,  
 xv.7, xx.2, 4v.  
*padakrama*, xxiv.6.  
*padagrahaṇa*, i.50:-ci.51-3.  
 iv.11, v.12, ix.22.  
*padapāṭha*, ci.v.5, v.2.  
*padasavīhitā*, xxiv.2 3:-  
 c xiii.5, 14, xxiv.4.  
*padasamaya*, c vi.14.  
*padodī*, xvi.2 8:-c iii.1, 15,  
 etc.  
*padainta*, xiv.28, xvi.14:-  
 ci.ii.1, iv.3 (*ap*), 5, ix.11-  
 15 etc. xiii.13 (-*tva*).  
*padūrtha*, c xiii.14.  
*padī*, vi.2.  
*padākadeṣa*, ci.23, 50, iv.35.  
 54, vi.10, 12, vii.6, 11, viii.  
 28, 29, xi.15, 17, xii.6, xiii.  
 14, xv.26, 29.  
*padhati*, cxiv.4.  
*papi vā*, xvi.18.  
*payuh*, xvii.8.  
*payasvān*, ix.21.  
*para*, i.8, 9, 30, iv.18, 45, 47,  
 50, v.7, 10, x.16, 25, xiii.  
 16, xiv.4, 9, 22, 29, xvi.19,  
 xxi.5, 9; -*para*, iii.1, 3, 4,  
 iv.4, 6, 24, 28, 30, 32, 33, 37,  
 38, 42, 44, 46, 52, v.4-6, 8,  
 14, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25-30,  
 32, 37, vi.5, 14, vii.15, viii.  
 2-4, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 23, 25-  
 31, 34, ix.1-5, 7, 8, 10, 13,  
 20, 22, 24, x.2-4, 8, 13, 14,  
 22, xi.9, 15, 18, xii.4, 5, xiii.  
 2-4, 11, 15, xiv.1, 9, 11-13,  
 16, 17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-8,  
 31, xv.4, xvi.1, 2, 10, 14, 27,  
 xix.3, xxi.7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16,  
 xxi.15; -*para*, xxi.2.  
*paratal*, c v.24, viii.6, x.10,  
 11, xx.3.  
*paratra*, c viii.33.  
*paratava*, ci.15, 30.  
*paranipāta*, ci.ii.2.  
*paranīmitta*, civ.7.25, v.24.  
 viii.6, 23, xiv.5, xvi.14v.  
*parabhuṭa*, c viii.33. xx.4.  
*parama*, xiv.8.  
*paraspara*, ci.3, v.2 (-*rin-*  
*vaya*), xv.6 (do.).  
*parāmarśin*, ci.ii.7.  
*parī*, l.15.  
*parī*, vii.4. viii.28.  
*parī vā*, viii.34.  
*parikalpanā*, c xviii.7v.  
*parigraha* in ap.-
- etc.; *parimāṇa*, xxiii.2:-ci.37.  
 and *ekap*, *nānip*, *prakti*-*parisamāpti*, ci.61.  
*tip*, *samīnap*.  
*padakāla*, ci.60. vi.4, viii.9,  
 xv.7, xx.2, 4v.  
*padakrama*, xxiv.6.  
*padagrahaṇa*, i.50:-ci.51-3.  
 iv.11, v.12, ix.22.  
*padapāṭha*, ci.v.5, v.2.  
*padasavīhitā*, xxiv.2 3:-  
 c xiii.5, 14, xxiv.4.  
*padasamaya*, c vi.14.  
*padodī*, xvi.2 8:-c iii.1, 15,  
 etc.  
*padainta*, xiv.28, xvi.14:-  
 ci.ii.1, iv.3 (*ap*), 5, ix.11-  
 15 etc. xiii.13 (-*tva*).  
*padūrtha*, c xiii.14.  
*padī*, vi.2.  
*padākadeṣa*, ci.23, 50, iv.35.  
 54, vi.10, 12, vii.6, 11, viii.  
 28, 29, xi.15, 17, xii.6, xiii.  
 14, xv.26, 29.  
*padhati*, cxiv.4.  
*papi vā*, xvi.18.  
*payuh*, xvii.8.  
*payasvān*, ix.21.  
*para*, i.8, 9, 30, iv.18, 45, 47,  
 50, v.7, 10, x.16, 25, xiii.  
 16, xiv.4, 9, 22, 29, xvi.19,  
 xxi.5, 9; -*para*, iii.1, 3, 4,  
 iv.4, 6, 24, 28, 30, 32, 33, 37,  
 38, 42, 44, 46, 52, v.4-6, 8,  
 14, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25-30,  
 32, 37, vi.5, 14, vii.15, viii.  
 2-4, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 23, 25-  
 31, 34, ix.1-5, 7, 8, 10, 13,  
 20, 22, 24, x.2-4, 8, 13, 14,  
 22, xi.9, 15, 18, xii.4, 5, xiii.  
 2-4, 11, 15, xiv.1, 9, 11-13,  
 16, 17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-8,  
 31, xv.4, xvi.1, 2, 10, 14, 27,  
 xix.3, xxi.7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16,  
 xxi.15; -*para*, xxi.2.  
*paratal*, c v.24, viii.6, x.10,  
 11, xx.3.  
*paratra*, c viii.33.  
*paratava*, ci.15, 30.  
*paranipāta*, ci.ii.2.  
*paranīmitta*, civ.7.25, v.24.  
 viii.6, 23, xiv.5, xvi.14v.  
*parabhuṭa*, c viii.33. xx.4.  
*parama*, xiv.8.  
*paraspara*, ci.3, v.2 (-*rin-*  
*vaya*), xv.6 (do.).  
*parāmarśin*, ci.ii.7.  
*parī*, l.15.  
*parī*, vii.4. viii.28.  
*parī vā*, viii.34.  
*parikalpanā*, c xviii.7v.  
*parigraha* in ap.-
- etc.; *parimāṇa*, xxiii.2:-ci.37.  
 and *ekap*, *nānip*, *prakti*-*parisamāpti*, ci.61.  
*tip*, *samīnap*.  
*padakāla*, ci.60. vi.4, viii.9,  
 xv.7, xx.2, 4v.  
*padakrama*, xxiv.6.  
*padagrahaṇa*, i.50:-ci.51-3.  
 iv.11, v.12, ix.22.  
*padapāṭha*, ci.v.5, v.2.  
*padasavīhitā*, xxiv.2 3:-  
 c xiii.5, 14, xxiv.4.  
*padasamaya*, c vi.14.  
*padodī*, xvi.2 8:-c iii.1, 15,  
 etc.  
*padainta*, xiv.28, xvi.14:-  
 ci.ii.1, iv.3 (*ap*), 5, ix.11-  
 15 etc. xiii.13 (-*tva*).  
*padūrtha*, c xiii.14.  
*padī*, vi.2.  
*padākadeṣa*, ci.23, 50, iv.35.  
 54, vi.10, 12, vii.6, 11, viii.  
 28, 29, xi.15, 17, xii.6, xiii.  
 14, xv.26, 29.  
*padhati*, cxiv.4.  
*papi vā*, xvi.18.  
*payuh*, xvii.8.  
*payasvān*, ix.21.  
*para*, i.8, 9, 30, iv.18, 45, 47,  
 50, v.7, 10, x.16, 25, xiii.  
 16, xiv.4, 9, 22, 29, xvi.19,  
 xxi.5, 9; -*para*, iii.1, 3, 4,  
 iv.4, 6, 24, 28, 30, 32, 33, 37,  
 38, 42, 44, 46, 52, v.4-6, 8,  
 14, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25-30,  
 32, 37, vi.5, 14, vii.15, viii.  
 2-4, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 23, 25-  
 31, 34, ix.1-5, 7, 8, 10, 13,  
 20, 22, 24, x.2-4, 8, 13, 14,  
 22, xi.9, 15, 18, xii.4, 5, xiii.  
 2-4, 11, 15, xiv.1, 9, 11-13,  
 16, 17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-8,  
 31, xv.4, xvi.1, 2, 10, 14, 27,  
 xix.3, xxi.7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16,  
 xxi.15; -*para*, xxi.2.  
*paratal*, c v.24, viii.6, x.10,  
 11, xx.3.  
*paratra*, c viii.33.  
*paratava*, ci.15, 30.  
*paranipāta*, ci.ii.2.  
*paranīmitta*, civ.7.25, v.24.  
 viii.6, 23, xiv.5, xvi.14v.  
*parabhuṭa*, c viii.33. xx.4.  
*parama*, xiv.8.  
*paraspara*, ci.3, v.2 (-*rin-*  
*vaya*), xv.6 (do.).  
*parāmarśin*, ci.ii.7.  
*parī*, l.15.  
*parī*, vii.4. viii.28.  
*parī vā*, viii.34.  
*parikalpanā*, c xviii.7v.  
*parigraha* in ap.-
- etc.; *parimāṇa*, xxiii.2:-ci.37.  
 and *ekap*, *nānip*, *prakti*-*parisamāpti*, ci.61.  
*tip*, *samīnap*.  
*padakāla*, ci.60. vi.4, viii.9,  
 xv.7, xx.2, 4v.  
*padakrama*, xxiv.6.  
*padagrahaṇa*, i.50:-ci.51-3.  
 iv.11, v.12, ix.22.  
*padapāṭha*, ci.v.5, v.2.  
*padasavīhitā*, xxiv.2 3:-  
 c xiii.5, 14, xxiv.4.  
*padasamaya*, c vi.14.  
*padodī*, xvi.2 8:-c iii.1, 15,  
 etc.  
*padainta*, xiv.28, xvi.14:-  
 ci.ii.1, iv.3 (*ap*), 5, ix.11-  
 15 etc. xiii.13 (-*tva*).  
*padūrtha*, c xiii.14.  
*padī*, vi.2.  
*padākadeṣa*, ci.23, 50, iv.35.  
 54, vi.10, 12, vii.6, 11, viii.  
 28, 29, xi.15, 17, xii.6, xiii.  
 14, xv.26, 29.  
*padhati*, cxiv.4.  
*papi vā*, xvi.18.  
*payuh*, xvii.8.  
*payasvān*, ix.21.  
*para*, i.8, 9, 30, iv.18, 45, 47,  
 50, v.7, 10, x.16, 25, xiii.  
 16, xiv.4, 9, 22, 29, xvi.19,  
 xxi.5, 9; -*para*, iii.1, 3, 4,  
 iv.4, 6, 24, 28, 30, 32, 33, 37,  
 38, 42, 44, 46, 52, v.4-6, 8,  
 14, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25-30,  
 32, 37, vi.5, 14, vii.15, viii.  
 2-4, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 23, 25-  
 31, 34, ix.1-5, 7, 8, 10, 13,  
 20, 22, 24, x.2-4, 8, 13, 14,  
 22, xi.9, 15, 18, xii.4, 5, xiii.  
 2-4, 11, 15, xiv.1, 9, 11-13,  
 16, 17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-8,  
 31, xv.4, xvi.1, 2, 10, 14, 27,  
 xix.3, xxi.7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16,  
 xxi.15; -*para*, xxi.2.  
*paratal*, c v.24, viii.6, x.10,  
 11, xx.3.  
*paratra*, c viii.33.  
*paratava*, ci.15, 30.  
*paranipāta*, ci.ii.2.  
*paranīmitta*, civ.7.25, v.24.  
 viii.6, 23, xiv.5, xvi.14v.  
*parabhuṭa*, c viii.33. xx.4.  
*parama*, xiv.8.  
*paraspara*, ci.3, v.2 (-*rin-*  
*vaya*), xv.6 (do.).  
*parāmarśin*, ci.ii.7.  
*parī*, l.15.  
*parī*, vii.4. viii.28.  
*parī vā*, viii.34.  
*parikalpanā*, c xviii.7v.  
*parigraha* in ap.-

- pluta*, i.4,36, x.24, xv.7, xxiv.5:-c.i.20, ii.12, iii.1, ix.9, x.15, xv.7 (*-vat*), 8. *pluti* in *mañḍukap-*
- phānat*, xii.12. *phalguni*, iv.12. *r. badh*: + *upa*, ci.59; + *sam*, cix.21, xiv.18; + *abhisam*, c.v.10: and *upabandha*, *prabandha*. *r. badh* (*bādh*), ci.61, xvi.19: and *bādhā* etc. *barsva*, ii.18:-c.ii.19. *bala*, ci.53, ii.18. *balavant*, cxvi.19, xxi.1. *bahule*, iv.11. *bahuvacana*, ci.23, v.24, viii.6. *bahuvara*, iv.40:-c.viii.10 (-*tva*), xvi.12,18 (-*two*). *bahūpdāna*, cvi.10,12, vii.6,11, viii.10,29, xi.15,17, xii.14, xvi.26. *Bādabhibhāra*, see p. 430. *bāñā*, xiii.9. *bāñavān*, ix.21. *bāñijāyā*, xiii.12. *bādhā*, -*dhana*, cxvi.19, xxi.5, xxiv.5. *bādhya*, cxxi.5. *bāhuya*, ci.v.23. *bibhṛtas ta*, iv.52. *bibhṛta*, iii.10. *r. budh*, ci.53, xiv.28, xix.4, xx.10, xxiii.2, xxiv.2; + ni, xxii.15. *budhniyā*, x.13. *bṛhatkapola*, cxxiv.6. *bṛhadgala*, cxxiv.6. *bṛhaspati*, vi.7. *bodhaka*, cxxi.14. *bodhana*, cxvi.29. *bodhā*, iii.8. *brahma ja*, iv.25. *brahmāz*, xiii.13. *Brahmapurāṇa*, cxxiv.6. *brahmakōka*, cxxiv.6. *brāhmaṇa*, ci.61 (-*vākyā*), xiv.33, xxii.1. *r. brū*, xviii.1:-ci.2,36,46, iii.1, iv.3 etc., v.22,37, viii.16, ix.23, x.10, xi.9, xiv.4 etc., xviii.2, xix.3, xxi.1,13, xxii.20. *bhakti*, cintr., xxi.6,15. *bhaṅga*, ci.53, ii.9, iv.52, v.10,22. *bhaṅgurā*, iii.5. *r. bhaj*, cv.26-30,38, vii.5-16. viii.24-32, ix.2 etc., x.24, xi.19, xiv.5, xvi.2 etc., xxi.2 etc., 15 (*bha-* *jyamāne*): and *-bhāj* etc., *vibhajya* etc.
- bhajā*, iii.8. *r. bhañ*, ci.15,57, xxiv.3v, 6. *bhadraḥ*, xii.3. *bhaya*, cxiv.4. *bharata*, iii.11. *Bharadvāja*, see p. 430. *bharā*, iii.12. *bharishyanti*, iv.19. *bharemā*, iii.10. *bhavataḥ*, iv.52. *bhavataḥ*, iii.12. *bhavant*, ci.21, iv.23. *bhava*, iii.8. *Bhavishyatpurāṇa*, cxxiv.6. *bhāga*, cv.1 (*veda-*), xiv.28, xix.3 (*veda-*), xxi.15 (*sva-* *ra-*). *bhāgadhe*, iv.11. *-bhāj*, cxiv.18 (*nishedha*): and *kāryabhāj*. *bhājana*, cxvii.8. *bhāmā*, cxviii.3. *bhāmitaḥ*, xii.8. *Bhāradvāja*, see p. 430. *bhāva*, v.1,31, x.17, xv.1, xvii.4, xx.1,5:-ci.61, ii.12, viii.16, xxiv.5: and *abh-*. *bhāvitva*, ci.11, x.12. *r. bhāsh*, ci.14, ii.14,33, viii.19. *bhāshā* in *chandobh-*. *bhāshya*, cintr. *r. bhd*, cintr. *-bhīh*, viii.14. *bhīna*, ci.3,29, iv.11, xiii.15, xxii.18. *bhīma*, *bhimasena*, cxviii.3. *bhūja*, xiv.8. *r. bhū*, ii.3, xxii.11, xxii.4:-c.v.1; + *sam*, ci.49, ii.7, iv.23, viii.13, xiii.15: and *sambhava*. *bhūta*, ci.2, iv.23, viii.5, etc. etc. *bhūte*, xiv.8. *bhūyāns*, ii.11. *bhūyānsah*, xvi.13. *bhūshana*, cintr., xvi.19. *bhūsura*, cintr. *bhēda*, civ.40,47, viii.18,21, xiii.9, xiv.22,28, xviii.3, xxii.2, xxii.7,18, xxiv.4: and *abh-*. *bhyām*, viii.14. *bhrāñgate*, xvi.22. *ma* (*m*), iv.7, xv.1, xvii.4, xxi.14. *mañṣatāi*, *mañṣye*, xvi.20. *mañhishṭhasya*, xvi.28. *makāra*, v.12,27,35, viii.4, xiii.1. *makshū*, iii.14. *mañgalā*, ci.1. *mañca*, c.vi.9. *mañpi*, xiii.9. *mandala*, cxxlii.16,17. *mañḍukapluti*, ci.17, iv.51. *mata*, ci.21,59, ii.2,19,27, 47, v.1,36-41, viii.18,19, etc. etc. *mati*, xvii.8 (*yathām-*). *madhumān*, ix.21. *madhya*, ii.6,41,45, xix.1:-ci.10, ii.2 (*-deṣa*), viii.15 (-*stha*), xxi.15. *madhyama*, xviii.4, xxii.11, xxii.5,10:-c.xxii.17. *r. man*, ci.15,18,19,21, ii.47, v.2,31, viii.23, xii.13, xiv.5,33, xv.9, xvii.1-8, xix.3, xxii.19; + *sam*, c.v.41, xv.8: and *mata* etc. *manah*, xxiii.6. *manāk*, viii.9. *mantra*, c.iii.9. *manda*, cxxii.20 (*am-*). *mandadhi*, cxii.3. *mandra*, xxii.11, xxii.5,10, 11,12,15,16:-c.xxii.13. *manyamānah*, xii.8. *mayāni*, vii.12. *marītāh*, xi.5. *martyān*, ix.21. *maryādā*, ci.1, iv.23. *r. mar*: + *parā*, cxv.3: and *parāmarśin*. *malimīlu*, vi.7. *mahān*, ix.21. *mahāprashānya*, xi.3. *Mahābhārata*, cxxiv.6. *Mahābhāshya*, ci.7, v.2. *mahi*, vi.2. *mahi*, iv.34. *mā*, x.13, xvi.8; *mā pātam*, iv.42. *mākih*, vi.5. *Mādākiya*, see p. 430. *mātātāh*, viii.8. *mātātra*, xviii.1, xxii.13:-ci.21,56,61, ii.13,19,25,33, etc. etc. *mātrā*, xxiv.6. *mātrika*, cxxi.15. *mādhyandina*, cxxiii.10. *Māyikāya*, see p. 430.

- lakshya*, c.i.22, iv.52, viii.5  
(-*tva*), xv.9.v.  
*laghu*, xxii.14,15, xxiv.5  
(-*tā*).  
r. *labh*, c.ii.11,14,16,21,25,  
27,32,34, iii.1, etc. etc.,  
xiv.4; +*upa*, c.ii.5, xxiii.  
10,13: and *upalabdhī* etc.  
r. *lamb*: +*ā*, c.iv.11.  
*lāghava*, c.vi.3.  
*lābha*, c.i.21.  
*lin̄ga*, c.i.49, ii.7, xiii.9, xv.6.  
r. *lup*, viii.16, ix.1,9, x.14,  
19,22, xi.1, xv.1, xvii.4 :-  
c.i.4,61, v.12-9, viii.1-7-9,  
x.14,20-2,23 (*luptavat*),  
xi.3-18, xii.2-10, xiii.2-4.  
*lega*, x.23:-c.iv.23, xiv.4.  
*loka*, c.iv.52, xxii.9 (-*vat*).  
*lokān*, vi.14.  
*loke*, iii.6, iv.53.  
*lopa*, i.56,57, v.11, xii.1, xiii.  
1,15, xv.1, xvii.4, xx.4,  
xxiv.5:-c.i.51,61, viii.8,  
17,18, ix.9, x.19,25, xii.  
6,8, xxi.14: and *al-*.  
*lopin*, i.23:-c.i.24.  
*lōukika*, c.i.1.  
*lyap*, c.xxi.14.
- va* (v), iii.4, xii.4.  
*vh*, xi.16.  
*vāñcam*, xvi.21.  
*vāñsagāh*, *vāñsate*, xvi.  
20.  
*vakāra*, ii.43, v.13,30, ix.16,  
x.15,19,21, xiii.3, xiv.2,  
21,26, xx.1,2.  
*vaktra*, c.ii.37.  
r. *vac*, i.61, xxiii.19:-c.i.7,50,  
52,53,59,60, ii.23,24, iv.2,  
3,11, viii.10,18, ix.24, xi.  
2, xii.1, xiii.4,5,8,13, xiv.  
4,5, etc. etc.; *vivaksh*,  
c.ii.37, xiii.15; +*pra*,  
c.xiv.4: and *uk्तā*, *uktī*,  
*vāc* etc., *vivakshā*.  
*vacah*, xi.16, xii.6.  
*vacama*, c.ii.1, ii.7, iii.2,7,8,  
iv.23,38, v.2, vi.5,13,14,  
vii.2, viii.8,13, ix.1, x.14,  
xi.16, xii.11, xiv.5,15,23,  
28, xv.8, xvi.29, xix.3.  
-*vat*, i.48,55, ii.21,51.  
-*vat*, iii.3.  
*vatsarasya rūpe*, iv.11.  
*vatsanusārīni*, c.xxi.13.  
*vatsanusr̄tī*, c.xxi.13.  
r. *vad*, xxii.20:-c.i.48, ii.9,  
iv.52, v.3, xiv.4,23, xvi.  
13, etc.; +*apa*, c.v.5:  
and *apavāda*, -*daka*.
- van*, iii.3, vii.6.  
*vanaspatibhyāh*, xii.8.  
*vapāçrapāñ*, iv.12.  
*vayunā*, iii.2.  
r. *var* : +*nī*, c.i.19, ii.14, iv.  
40, xi.1, xiii.4, xiv.4, xx.  
2; +*ve*, c.xxi.14: and *vi-*  
*vṛta sanīvṛta*.  
*Vararuci*, c.i.18, ii.14,19, iv.  
40, vi.19, xviii.7, xxi.15.  
*varga*, i.10,27, ii.51 (-*vat*).  
*varcas*, iv.53.  
r. *varj*, c.iv.52, ix.20, xvi.25.  
-*varja*, c.ix.20.  
*varna*, i.1,16,20,56, ii.7, xiii.  
5, xvii.7,8, xxii.1,2,4,  
xxiii.1-3:-c.viii.15, xvi.8-  
10, xx.2, etc.  
*varṇakramu*, xxiv.6.  
*varṇasūñhitā*, xxiv.2:-  
c.xiii.14, xxiv.4.  
*varṇita*, c.i.1, xviii.1.  
r. *varī*, c.ii.47, iii.1,15, iv.5,  
23,45,52,54, v.10,19, etc.  
etc.; +*anu*, c.i.36, ii.30,  
viii.34, x.9; +*nī*, c.i.18,  
51,59,60, ii.25, ix.9, x.15,  
19, xi.1, xiv.5,11, xv.3,  
xxii.6: +*pra*, c.v.1,3,22,  
xv.5: and *anuvartana*,  
*anuvṛtti*, *āvṛtti*, *nivartaka*,  
*nivṛtti*.  
*vartamānatva*, c.iii.15.  
*vartayā*, iii.12.  
*vartayāstī*, xvi.18.  
*vartin*, c.ii.47, viii.23, ix.18,  
xxi.3.  
*vardhayā*, *vardhā*, iii.8.  
*varshayātī*, iii.10.  
*varshā*, iii.5.  
*varshishthē*, xi.16.  
*varṣān*, ix.21.  
*vasīyā*, xvi.13.  
*vasuh*, viii.31.  
*vasū*, iii.7.  
*vastāh*, viii.8.  
*vā*, i.24,44,45, ii.50, xviii.7,  
xix.1, xx.2, xxii.7.  
*vāh*, vii.2, viii.8.  
*vāñ eshāh*, xi.16.  
*vākyā*, c.ii.61, xxiii.3,3 (-*tā*).  
*vāghā*, vii.13.  
*vāc*, xviii.4, xxiii.3,4:-c.xiv.  
4,5, xxiii.5-10, xxiv.5.  
*vācuka*, c.i.18, v.28, xxi.9,  
xxii.4.  
*vācayati*, iv.52.  
*vācīn*, c.i.15, v.10, xvi.30.  
*vācyā*, c.i.18, iv.47, xiv.5.  
*vājapeya*, xi.3:-c.i.61.  
*Vājasaneyin*, c.xiv.33.  
*vāñah gāta*, xii.12.
- vāñjāyā*, xiii.12.  
*vāñih*, xiii.12.  
*vātāh*, xi.5.  
*vātā*, iii.5.  
*Vāsopra*, see p. 430.  
*vādu*, c.xiii.9.  
*vān*, iii.3.  
*vāyu*, ii.2.  
*vāyuh*, iv.42.  
*vāraruca*, c.intr., ii.47, viii.  
20,22.  
*vārunān*, v.21.  
*Vālmīki*, see p. 430.  
*vārcī*, iii.7.  
*vāsasī*, iv.17.  
*vāhanāh*, vii.6.  
*vi*, i.15.  
*vārshā*, xi.3.  
*vikalpa*, c.i.19,46, viii.22, ix.  
1, xiii.16.  
*vikāra*, i.28,56, xv.5, xxiv.  
5:-c.iv.3, v.9, ix.11,12,14,  
15, x.8,9.  
*vikārin*, i.23:-c.i.24.  
*virkta*, i.51, xvi.3,15:-c.iii.  
51,59,60, ii.25, ix.9, x.15,  
19, xi.1, xiv.5,11, xv.3,  
xxii.6: +*pra*, c.v.1,3,22,  
xv.5: and *anuvartana*,  
*anuvṛtti*, *āvṛtti*, *nivartaka*,  
*nivṛtti*.  
*vigatatva*, c.xiv.28.  
*vigraha*, c.xiv.4.  
*vicakshāna*, xxiv.6:-c.xviii.  
4.  
*vijñeyatva*, c.v.2, xxi.1, xxiv.  
5.  
r. *vid*, xxii.14:-c.i.1 (*vidya-*  
*mānuta*), ii.47, ix.24,  
xii.14, etc.  
*vidatrān*, ix.21.  
*viduh*, vi.5.  
*vidmā*, iii.10.  
*vidvā*, xvi.13.  
*vidvan*, vii.14.  
*vidhā*, c.xiv.33, xvi.29,  
xviii.7, xix.3, xxiv.5, etc.  
*vidhāna*, c.ii.11,15,19,34,53,  
ii.9,13, iv.7,11, v.2,3,35,  
x.10,12,15, xii.11, xiv.5,  
xvi.29, xvii.5, xxi.1, xxiii.  
7.  
*vidhāyaka*, c.xix.3.  
*vidhi*, v.2:-c.i.14,40,43,61,  
ii.14,19,23,25,44, iii.8, v.  
1,41, vii.15, viii.7,15,25  
(*yathā*) 28 (do.), ix.3-6,  
8,13,17,22,24, x.10,11,13,  
24, xi.1, xiii.3, xiv.14,22,  
xv.8, xvi.3,5,29, xvii.1,3,  
4, xix.5, xx.3, xxi.6, xxii.  
9,10, xxiii.16, xxiv.5.

<i>gikshā</i> , c.i.1, 2, 21, ii.2, xiv.5, 28, xix.3, 12, xxi.1, 15, xxii.13, xxiii.10, 17.	<i>shu</i> , vii.2. <i>shumnaḥ</i> , xiii.15.	<i>sauñjñā</i> , c.i.2-15, 31-9, 49, ii.4-6, 9, iii.9, iv.3, 11, 12, 17, xi.3, xv.6, xix.1, 5, xx. 2, xxii.16.
<i>gikshā</i> , iii.8.	<i>shoñaca</i> , i.5.	<i>sattvā</i> , vi.12.
<i>gikshakāra</i> , c.i.1, xxi.15.	<i>shṇa</i> , xiii.14.	<i>satya</i> , c.i.21, 53, ii.18, viii.16, xiii.15.
<i>gipre</i> , iv.11.		<i>satyabñamā</i> , c.xviii.3.
<i>piras</i> , ii.3, xxiii.10:-c xx.12 ( <i>komalā</i> ).	<i>sa</i> (s), iv.7, v.32, viii.23, 26, xiii.15.	<i>satrā</i> , iii.5.
<i>gīve</i> , iv.11.	<i>sa</i> (pron.), v.2, xi.19, xviii. 4, xix.1, xx.3.	r. <i>sad</i> : + <i>pratyā</i> , c.ii.42, v. 24: and <i>dsanna</i> .
r. <i>cish</i> : + <i>vi</i> , c.i.30, ii.44, iv. 7, 34, v.18, 19, 28, vi.5, x. 10, xiv.5, 19, xxi.1: and <i>avīśiṣṭa</i> , <i>vīśeshu</i> etc., <i>vādiṣiṣṭya</i> .	<i>sah</i> , v.15, 17, xi.9.	<i>sadane</i> , iv.11.
<i>gishta</i> , c.i.1.	<i>saiñyukta</i> , xxii.15:-c xxi.5 (as.).	<i>sadr̄a</i> , xi.19:-c v.28, xxiv. 6.
<i>gīkā</i> , iii.2.	<i>saiñyuta</i> , c.i.54 (as.).	<i>sadohavirdhāne</i> , iv.11.
<i>gīrshan</i> , xiii.13.	<i>saiñyoga</i> , xxi.4 (- <i>gddi</i> ), 15, xxii.14, 15, xxiv.3:-c xvii. 4.	<i>sadbhāva</i> , cxiii.14, xiv.28, xvi.29.
<i>gūḍha</i> , c.v.28.	<i>saiñvrakshana</i> , c.vi.5.	<i>sadhih</i> , vi.5.
<i>guddhā</i> , iii.2.	<i>saiñvarta</i> , ii.4, 27:-c xxi.15, xxii.9 (- <i>tā</i> ).	<i>sani</i> , <i>sanih</i> , <i>sanih</i> , vi.12.
<i>guñruvā</i> , xvi.13.	<i>saiñvyavahāra</i> , c.i.14. xxii. 3.	<i>saniñatānebhāyāh</i> , vi.12.
<i>gushmāh</i> , xi.16.	<i>saiñcita</i> , <i>saiñcītā</i> , xvi. 26.	<i>saiñdeha</i> , i.25:-c i.14, 26, iv. 23, v.1, xxi.2, 5.
<i>gūmya</i> , cxx.2.	<i>saiñlesha</i> , c.ii.33.	<i>saiñdhāna</i> , ii.2, xxiv.3:- c xiv.15.
<i>gīngē</i> , iv.11.	<i>saiñevā</i> , xvi.26.	<i>saiñdūlā</i> , c.ii.18, x.15, 24, 25, xxi.1.
<i>gīnutā</i> , iii.10.	<i>saiñisad</i> , xxiv.6.	<i>saiñdhyakshara</i> , c.i.33, ii.47, 48, xviii.1.
<i>gesha</i> , i.6, 14, 42, 46, ii.28, xxii.14:-c i.44-5, ii.29, 47, 'xi.15, xxi.15.	<i>saiñisarga</i> , xxiii.2.	<i>saiñnaddhāh</i> , xii.3.
<i>geshalhāta</i> , c.ii.47, iv.3, xi.3.	<i>saiñr̄shā</i> , xvi.26.	<i>saiñnikarsha</i> , cxxiv.3.
<i>Gāityādyana</i> , see p. 430.	<i>saiñskṛta</i> , <i>saiñskṛtya</i> , xvi.26.	<i>saiñnipāta</i> , x.12.
gō, xvi.2.	<i>saiñsr̄d</i> , xvi.26.	<i>sapūrva</i> , v.19, viii.22.
gōñd, xiii.12.	<i>saiñsr̄d</i> , v.1, xv.8, xxi.10, xxiv.1-4:-c i.60, 60 (as.), iii.1, 8, v.3, vii.10, ix.22, 24, x.10, 12, xi.9, xiii.5, 14, xiv.29, xv.7, xyi.29, xix. 3, xx.2: and <i>saiñihita</i> .	<i>sapta</i> , xxiii.4, 11.
gōñyā, x.18.	<i>sak</i> , vii.12.	<i>saptamī</i> , c.v.10, xvi.25.
gōñyā, xi.3.	<i>sakala</i> , c.iv.52, xvi.29 (- <i>pa-</i> <i>da</i> ).	<i>sapte</i> , vi.5.
grapayān	<i>sakāya</i> , xvi.10.	<i>sabheyāh</i> , vi.12.
gravāna	<i>sakāra</i> , v.6, 10, 14, vi.1, 14, xvi.1:-c ii.44.	<i>sam</i> , v.6, xxiii.4; <i>sam in-</i> <i>dra</i> , vii.2.
gri	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	<i>sama</i> , i.42, 45, 46, xvii.2, xxiii.19.
gru	<i>saiñkṣhepa</i> , c.xii.6.	<i>samahiryāhāra</i> , cxiii.14.
grudhī	<i>saiñkhyā</i> , xvi.25:-c i.11, ii.19, x.15, 22, xxiii.16.	<i> samaya</i> , c.ii.1, iv.5, vi.14, xiii.17.
greyā	<i>saiñkhyāna</i> , i.48 (as.):-c i. 59.	<i>samarthana</i> , cxiii.14.
groni	<i>saiñghāta</i> , c.xxii.3.	<i>samarthanīya</i> , c.xvi.19.
r. <i>gīsh</i> : + <i>sam</i> , c.ii.12, xvii. 4: and <i>upāñlesha</i> , <i>duh-</i> <i>gīshīta</i> , <i>prañgīshīta</i> , <i>saiñ-</i> <i>gīshīta</i> .	<i>sacasa</i> , iii.8.	<i>samarthay</i> , c.v.3, xiii.4v, xiv.4.
gloka	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	<i>samāna</i> , c.ii.23, 47, 48, iv.23, v.27, viii.19, 21, ix.8, xxi. 6, 15.
gvā	<i>saiñkṣhepa</i> , c.xii.6.	<i>samānakāla</i> , i.33.
gvāsu	<i>saiñkhyā</i> , xvi.25:-c i.11, ii.19, x.15, 22, xxiii.16.	<i>samānapada</i> , iv.54, xiii.6, xxii.13:-c xiii.15, 16.
sha (sh)	<i>saiñkhyāna</i> , i.48 (as.):-c i. 59.	<i>samāndākshara</i> , i.2, x.2, xv. 6:-c i.3, 4, x.10, xv.9.
xiii.6.	<i>saiñghāta</i> , c.xxii.3.	<i>samāñdn</i> , ix.23.
sha h	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	<i>samāñdaya</i> , i.1:-c i.2, 5, ii.1.
shakdrā	<i>saiñkṣhepa</i> , c.xii.6.	<i>samāsā</i> , c.ii.2, iii.9, v.1, x.6, xiii.9.
44.	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	
shat	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	
shāñ	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	
shāñ	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	
shatvā	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	
c.51, 60, v.3, vi.4, 5, 13, vii.2, viii.16, 35.	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	
shash	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	
shashtha	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	
-shi	<i>saiñketa</i> , c.i.21.	

<i>sparca</i> , i.7,10, ii.44, v.27,34,	11. xiv.29,31, xviii.2,5,	+ <i>vyā</i> , cxxiv.4v; + <i>pari</i> ,
xiii.15, xiv.2,3,9,27, xxi.	xix.1, xxi.10,11, xxiv.5:	cii.59, iii.1; + <i>upasam</i> , ii.
9,12.	-c.x.10, xvii.6, xix.3, xx.	18,32:-cii.22,23: and <i>udāharana</i> , <i>parihāra</i> , <i>upasamihṛta</i> , - <i>hāra</i> , <i>samāhāra</i> .
<i>sparyana</i> , ii.33: and <i>as-</i> .	1, xxii.15,17,17 (- <i>tva</i> ).	
<i>spaçah</i> , vi.12.	<i>svarūpa</i> , ci.21,40, v.2, xvi.	<i>harā</i> , iii.12.
<i>spashta</i> , cxvii.8 ( <i>atis-</i> , <i>as-</i> ):	30, xxi.10,15, xxiv.4,6.	<i>harīn</i> , cxxi.15.
and <i>vis-</i> .	<i>svā</i> , iii.5.	<i>harita</i> (or <i>hār-</i> ), cxxi.15.
<i>spashtikar</i> , cxiii.15v.	<i>svādhyāya</i> , cxviii.1.	<i>hari</i> , iv.15.
<i>sphuṭikar</i> , ci.9, xiii.15.	<i>svānāśo dīvi</i> , vi.2.	<i>hal</i> , cix.24.
<i>sphuranti</i> , vi.18.	<i>svāyoga</i> , c.ii.25.	<i>havānī</i> , vii.11.
<i>sphuritatva</i> , ci.25.	<i>svāra</i> , xvii.6, xx.8, xxiii.20:	<i>havishmān</i> , ix.21.
<i>syah</i> , v.15.	-c xxiii.17.	<i>hastavinyasa</i> , cxxiii.17.
<i>sra</i> , xvii.2.	<i>svārtha</i> , ci.ii.17.	<i>hāh</i> , viii.8.
<i>srādi</i> , i.60, xv.4:-c xvii.5.	<i>svāhākṛti</i> , iii.7.	<i>hāritī</i> (or <i>har-</i> ), cxxi.15.
<i>sriñdhāh</i> , xii.8.	<i>svikar</i> , ci.19,21,25, iv 23,52,	<i>Hārīta</i> , see p. 430.
<i>sva</i> , xxiv.4 ( <i>yathī-</i> ):-c xiv.	xi.3, xii.14.	<i>hi</i> , iv.37,44, vi.2, xvi.13;
28.	<i>svikara</i> , civ.23, x.12, xiv.5.	<i>hi payasvin</i> , ix.21;
<i>svatah</i> , ci.ii.23, xxi.7.	<i>srenā</i> , iii.10.	<i>hi shtā</i> , iii.8.
<i>svatantra</i> , cxxi.6.	<i>ha</i> (h), ii.9, iv.7, xii.4, xiv.	<i>hiṇuyāt</i> , <i>hiṇoti</i> , xiii.12.
<i>svadega</i> , ci.59.	26.	<i>hiranmayam</i> , xiii.8.
<i>svadhāvah</i> , xii.8.	<i>ha</i> , xvi.2.	<i>hiranyavarṇīya</i> , ix.20, xi.
<i>svabhāva</i> , cxiii.14 (- <i>tva</i> ),	<i>haṁsapadā</i> (or <i>-pīḍā</i> ), cxxi.	3.
xiv.28.	15.	<i>hūtamān</i> , ix.21.
<i>svayampāṭha</i> , ci.9.	<i>hakāra</i> , i.13, ii.6,9,46,47, v.	<i>hrd</i> , cxxiii.17.
r. <i>svar</i> , xx.2,3:-c i.41: and	38, xiv.19, xvi.27, xxi.14:	<i>hṛdayā</i> , iii.2.
<i>atisvārya</i> .	-c.ii.3,7,44.	<i>hetayah</i> , xii.8.
<i>svara</i> , i.5,33, ii.8,31,47, viii.	r. <i>han</i> : in <i>nihata</i> .	<i>hotah</i> , viii.8.
3, ix.10, xi.18, xii.4, xiii.	<i>han</i> , vii.11.	<i>hraszyā</i> , xvi.13.
16, xiv.1,16, xv.1, xvi.2,	<i>hanu</i> , ii.12 ( <i>oshtīg-</i> ), 16:-	<i>hrasva</i> , i.3,20,31,41, iii.1, ix.
xvii.5, xxi.1,2, xxii.14,	cxxiii.2.	18, xvi.16, xxii.15, xxiv.
xxiv.6:-c xviii.3, xxii.12.	<i>hanū</i> , iii.7.	5.
xxiii.7,11,15-7 etc etc.	<i>hanūmīla</i> , ii.35:-c ii.17.	<i>hrasvatva</i> , ci.52.
<i>svara</i> , vi.13.	<i>hantund</i> , iii.10.	<i>hrasvārdha</i> , i.37:-c i.42,44,
<i>svarabhakti</i> , ii.19, xxi.6,15:	<i>hanyat</i> , vii.3.	46, xvii.5.
-c.i.6, ii.33, xxi.16.	r. <i>har</i> , xvii.8; + <i>udā</i> , xxii.3:	<i>hrāduni</i> , iii.7.
<i>svarasā</i> , c.v.22.	-cxi.3 xiii.13, xvi.12	<i>hvāh</i> , viii.8.
<i>svarāṅga</i> , xxi.1.	xxiii.4,17; + <i>samā</i> , ci.40;	
<i>svarita</i> , i.40. x.12,16, xii.9.		

- Dental mutes (*t*, *th*, *d*, *dh*, *n*), how formed, ii.38: see also the several letters.  
*dh*, dental mute, ii.38.  
*dh*, lingual mute, ii.37.
- Diphthongs (*e*, *ai*, *o*, *au*): see the several letters.
- Duplication, of *ñ*, *n*, final, ix.18-9; of *ch*, *kh*, *bh*, xiv.8; of aspirate mutes in the MSS., p. 290,294; duplication in consonant groups, xiv.1-7,9-28.
- e*, how uttered, ii.15-7,23; combination with preceding *a*, *ā*, x.6; with following vowel, ix.11,13, x.19; initial *a* elided after, xi.1 etc.; resulting accent, xii.9-11; final *a* elided before, x.14; *pragraha* ending, iv.8-54.
- Elision, see Omission.
- Euphonic alteration, concerns single element only, i.56; of a cited word, does not suspend rules, i.51; mode of intimating in rules, i.23,28.
- Final consonant, belongs to preceding vowel, xxi.3; makes heavy syllable, xxi.14.
- g*, guttural mute, ii.35.  
*gh*, guttural mute, ii.35.
- Grammarians quoted by name in the rules and comment, p. 430.
- Grave accent (*anudāta*), defined, i.39; how produced, xxii.10; grave syllable, when converted to enclitic circumflex, xiv.29-31; when uttered at acute pitch, xxi.10-1.
- Groups of consonants, occurring in Tāittirīya-Saṅhitā, detail of their division in syllabification, p. 380-2,385: make a heavy syllable, xxi.14.
- Guttural mutes (*k*, *kh*, *g*, *gh*, *ñ*), how formed, ii.35: see also the several letters.
- h*, a spirant, i.9; not surd, i.13; intermediate between surd and sonant, ii.6; inheres in sonant aspirates, ii.9; uttered in the throat, ii.46; has same position as following vowel, ii.47; combination with preceding final mute, v.38-41; before a nasal, *uñsiṣya* inserted after, xxi.14.  
*h*, see *visarjaniya*.
- Heavy syllable, xxi.14.
- i*, *ī*: how formed, ii.22; combination with preceding *a*, *ā*, x.4; with following vowel, x.15; resulting circumflex, x.16:-*i*, final, result of irregular prolongation, iii.7,13; *pragraha* ending, iv.8-54.
- Increment, how intimated, i.23.
- Insertions, of *g*, *s*, *d*, anomalous, v.4-8; of *k*, *t*, v.32,33; after spirant before mute, xiv.9.
- j*, palatal mute, ii.36; *t* before, to *j*, v.23; *n* before, to *ñ*, v.24.
- jh*, palatal mute, ii.36; not found in the Saṅhitā, p. 72.
- jihvāñmūliya* (*χ*), guttural spirant, i.9, ii.44-5; its designation, i.18; occurrence, ix.2-4.
- k*, guttural mute, ii.35; inserted after *ñ* before *s*, *sh*, v.32; *h* to *s* or *sh* before, viii.23 etc.
- kampa*, peculiar affection of a circumflex followed by another circumflex, xix.3-5; differences between the Tāittirīya and other texts as to its occurrence and treatment, p. 362-3.
- kandikās*, division of *anuvākas* into, not recognized by the Prātiçākhva, p. 5,33, 427,430.
- Kārttikeya, asserted author of the Prātiçākhya, p. 1.
- kh*, guttural mute, ii.35; *h* to *s* or *sh* before, viii.23 etc.; doubled in certain words, xiv.8.
- krama*-text, p. 429.
- kṣhdipra* circumflex, xx.1; its occurrence, x.16; its tone, xx.9.
- l*, semivowel, i.8; how produced, ii.42; assimilates preceding *t*, *m*, *n*, v.25,26, 28; resulting nasal *l*, v.26,28; changed to *d*, xiii.16; duplication after, xiv.2,3, 7.
- l*, not a simple vowel, p. 11; of short quantity, i.31; how produced, ii.18.
- Labial mutes (*p*, *ph*, *b*, *bh*, *m*), how formed, ii.39: see also the several letters.
- Light syllable, xxi.15.
- Lingual mutes (*t*, *th*, *d*, *dh*, *n*), how formed, ii.37: see also the several letters.
- Long vowel, i.35: and see Prolongation.
- m*, labial mute, ii.39; assimilated to following mute, v.27; and semivowel (except *r*), v.28-31, xiii.3; irregularly dropped, v.12; to *ñ* before *r* or spirant, v.29, xiii.2; unchanged before *rd*, xiii.4.
- Manuscripts of Prātiçākhya and commentary: see Tāittirīya-Prātiçākhya.
- Mutes, i.7; division and names, i.10,11; what mutes are surd, i.12; mode of formation of the various series, ii.35-9; their designation, i.27: see also the several series and letters.

conversion to *sh*, v.10, vi.1-13; inserted after *n* before *t*, vi.14; insertions of *k* and *t* before, v.3-32; *s* from *h* before *k*, *kh*, *p*, viii.23-35.

Schools of Vedic study cited by name, p. 427.

Semivowels (*y*, *r*, *l*, *v*), i.8; their effect on division of syllables, xxi.7: and see the several letters.

*sh*, lingual spirant, i.9, ii.44; conversion of *s* to, v.10, vi.1-13; insertions of *k* and *t* before, v.32-3; changes following *t*, *th*, to *t*, *th*, vii.13-4; *n* to *ñ*, xiii.6 etc.; *sh* from *h* before *k*, *kh*, *p*, viii.23-35.

Short vowels, i.31-3.

Sibilants (*y*, *sh*, *s*), see the several letters, and Spirants.

Similar vowels, i.3,4.

Sonant utterance, ii.4; sonant consonants, i.14.

Spirants (*χ*, *ɔ*, *sh*, *s*, *ɸ*, *h*), i.9; quality as regards sonancy, i.12-3; require more breath, ii.11; mode of articulation, ii.44-5; *h* converted into, ix.2-6; insertion after, before mute, xiv.9-11; aspiration of a surd mute before, xlv.12-3; effect of, on division of syllables, xxi.9; see also the several letters.

Surd mute, converted to sonant before sonant, viii.3; to nasal before nasal, viii.2,4.

Surd utterance, ii.5,10; surd consonants, i.12.

*svarabhakti*, how uttered, ii.19; occurrence, xxi.15-6; belongs to what syllable, xxi.6; various kinds of, p. 392-3. *svarita*, see Circumflex.

Syllabification, xxi.1-14.

Syllables, heavy and light, xxii.14-5.

*t*, dental mute, ii.38; changed to *c* or *j* before palatals, v.22,23; to *l* before *l*, v.25; *n* becomes *ñs* before, vi.14; inserted after *t*, *n*, before *s*, *sh*, v.33; changed to *t* after *sh*, vii.13.

*t*, lingual mute, ii.37; adds *t* before *s*, *sh*, v.33; *t* changed to, after *sh*, vii.13.

*tāirovyanjana* enclitic circumflex, xx.7; its tone, xx.12.

Tāittiriya-Āranyaka, phrases quoted from, in commentary, p. 425-6.

Tāittiriya-Brāhmaṇa, phrases quoted from, in commentary, p. 425-6.

Tāittiriya-Prātiçākhyā, manuscripts of, p. 1-3; various readings in its text, see Additions and Corrections, p. 467; its commentary, see Tribhāshyaratna; right to its name, p. 427; relation of the text it implies to the known Tāittiriya-Sanhita, p. 424-8; grammarians quoted by it, p. 430; classification of

their quoted doctrines, p. 430-2; presumable alterations in it, p. 432; its character, p. 432-3.

Tāittiriya-Sanhita, relation of, to the text assumed in the Prātiçākhyā, p. 424-7; its divisions, p. 430; names of different parts of, p. 430.

Text, four kinds of, xxiv.1-4; various forms of, assumed by the Prātiçākhyā, p. 428-30.

*th*, dental mute, ii.38; changed to *th* after *sh*, vii.14.

*th*, lingual mute, ii.37; *th* changed to, after *sh*, vii.14.

Tones (*yama*), the twenty-one, xxii.12, xxiii.11 etc.; tone of *om*, xviii.4.

Tribhāshyaratna, manuscripts of, p. 1-3; different versions, p. 3; its sources, and meaning of its name, p. 6-7; works quoted in it, p. 435; its relation to and treatment of the Prātiçākhyā, 433-4; quotation of phrases not found in the Sanhita, 424-6.

*u*, *ū*: how formed, ii.24-5; combination with preceding *a*, *ā*, x.5:—combination of *u* with following vowel, x.15; resulting circumflex, x.16:—*ū*, *prāgraha* as final, iv.5; result of irregular prolongation, iii.7,14; occurrence of *prārishiya* circumflex in. x.17.

*u*, particle, combination of, ix.16-7; finals combined with, p. 102-4.

*udātta*; see Acute.

Uncombinable final vowels, x.13,18,24,25. *upadhmāniya* (*ɸ*), labial spirant, i.9, ii.44-5; its designation, i.18; occurrence, ix.2-4.

Upāngas, enumerated, p. 422.

*v*, semivowel, i.8; how uttered, ii.43; irregular omission of, as initial, v.13; final, dropped, x.19-23; nasal *v* from *m*, v.28,30; duplication after, xiv.2; resolution of usual *v* into *uv*, p. 64. Vājasaneyi-Brāhmaṇa, referred to in commentary, p. 317.

*varvakrama*, see Duplication.

Veda, rewards promised for studying or teaching, p. 420-1: see also Yajurveda. Tāittiriya-Sanhita.

Vedāngas, enumerated, p. 422.

*vikrama* accent, xix.1,2; its tone, xvii.6. *visurjanīya* (*h*), not a spirant, p. 14; how uttered, ii.46,48; is surd, i.12; its designation, i.18; authorized in *sanhita* only before pause and *ksh*, ix.3; becomes spirant before surd, ix.2; dropped before spirant followed by surd, ix.1; to *s* or *sh*, before *k*, *kh*, *p*, viii.23-35; to *sh* before *t*, vi.5; omitted in *sah* etc., v.15-7; to *r* (except before *r*), viii.

## ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

PART of these emendations are due to Prof. Weber, who has called my attention to them in private communications. A few slight misprints, of obvious character, are not noted here.

p. 2, l. 25. The MS. used by Weber was another (No. 504) in the same collection, containing only the text (incomplete) of the Prātiçākhyā.

p. 3, l. 1. Dr. Rost's description of these MSS. has not yet appeared. It appears, however, that the rules of the Prātiçākhyā are read interspersed in the commentary also, as well as prefixed to it in a body (with separate paging).

p. 3, l. 4. The differences of reading in the Prātiçākhyā text itself are more numerous than is here stated. They have been pointed out in the course of the work (either in the notes on the rules, or in the various readings to the comment)—namely, as occurring (with here and there an addition, omitted in its proper place) in i.61, ii.17,51, iv.11,39 (T. W. *ahne*, for *'hne*), v.13,20 (G. M. *vakāraç*, for *-ram*; a mere blunder), vii.8 (G. M. *yajush*, for *yajuh*), 12, viii.8 (T., it should be added, has dropped both *sanuta* and *stanuta*), 13,35, ix.21,22, x.11 (T. W. B. O. *anunāśikam*, for *'run-*), 13 (G. M. *-pd asiparo budhnīyā jyā d' pūshā aminanta ḍrṣe*, which is perhaps the more acceptable reading, since it gives the uncombinable finals their uncombinable quality in the rule also), 22, xi.16 (G. M. *adabdhāsa* and *ashādhab*, with unelided *a*), 17 (G. M. *ahniyā md "mb dī*), 18,19 (G. M. repeat the whole rule, instead of its last two words only), xii.4,9 (T. O. *asmin*, for *tas-*), xiii.4,13,14 (see farther on), 15, xiv.3,8 (G. M. *upasargaç ca pātha*: a blunder only), 13,32, xvii.1,5 (G. M. *parīstān anant*: a blunder), 7,13 (G. M. omit *pīpīv* in the rule, as well as its example in the comment; but they give the word in the rehearsal at the beginning of the comment), 16,19,22,26, xvii.2,4, xviii.5 (T. *svaritaç ca pl-*), xx.9 (G. M. substitute in the text-MS. rule xvii.6, except the word *paushkarasadeh*), xxi.5,6,14, xxii.7 (W. O. also have *-shakā* in the rule, but not in the comment), xxiii.2,6,10,12,14,20, xxiv.4. The reading adopted for rule xiii.14 is that of T. G. M. (save that T. has *sīthā* for *shāpa*, and *rāvīna*, with *virdmā* under the *v*; and G. M. have *rāvīna* in the text-MS., and *rāvāvna* in the MSS. with comment); W. gives *rāñ shāpā sīthā māna rāvā* (with *virdmā* under both *v* and *n*); for (.), the collator has noted nothing; B. reads *rāñ shāpā sīthā māna rāvā grāvā*. Other evident copyists' errors occur, of too little account to be worth notice.

A reading has been adopted contrary to the authority of all the MSS. at ix.1,20 (where the MSS.-reading is *ikāraūkārap-*), xi.1,17. The writing of *iñgya* for *iñgya* was noted under i.48.

p. 9, l. 16. The commentator, as will be seen under xxi.14, interprets out of existence the *nāśikya* as an independent element.

p. 11, l. 7. The structure of *ṛ* is defined by the commentator under xxi.15.

p. 18, l. 12. The commentator refers to some "different reading" (perhaps in his Cikshā? there is no trace of it in the Prātiçākhyā), beginning *pra para'pa sam*, but declares it to have to do only with the addition to all these words of *iti* (in the *pada*-text, namely, which writes *e' ti* for *a*, *ape' ti* for *apa*, and so on) and not to their receiving the name *upasarga*. I still fail to see any reason for the limitation of the class to half its usual number.

p. 23, l. 13. Dele the hyphen at the end of the line.

p. 33, l. 16. One may conjecture that rule 43 formerly concluded the treatment of accent in this chapter, and applied to all the three kinds of accent; but, rules 44-7, on the circumflex, being later interpolated, the connection made it necessary to understand this also as applying to the circumflex alone.

p. 34, rule 46. The same example (from iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>) is quoted by the comment under this rule as under rules 43 and 47.

p. 37, l. 19. Compare under rules xvi.26,29, where this claim is distinctly made. But it is not entirely well founded, for there are cases where combinations of sounds which are *padas* are quoted as *paddikadegas*: thus *han* in vii.11, *pā* in xvi.2, *hi* in xvi.13, etc.

- p. 232, l. 26. I have noted here all the cases in which the *samhitā*-text shows *dhā*, *mā*, or *pd* before *asi*; it appears, however, from Weber's edition of the *Sanhita*, that a part of them have *h* in *pada*-text after the *ā*.
- p. 233, l. 11 from below. Read (in part of the edition) *prape've* (for *-pd*).
- p. 239, l. 6. Read *o* for *a*.
- p. 265, l. 5. The combination *úrdhvo asthāt* is in fact read first at iv.2.14, in an *ukhyā*-passage.
- p. 265, l. 10. There is, however, a case in which *a* is omitted according to the general rules, when by the letter, though not the spirit, of i.61 it ought to be retained; see under i.61 (p. 47).
- p. 273, rule 12. I should doubtless have done better to adopt the reading *vāñjāya* (for *bāñ-*), in rule, version, and example.
- p. 291, l. 24. *Achāvākāh* is found at vii.1.5.
- p. 296, l. 9. Read *hksh* (by ix.3); and this would change the treatment of the group, since *h* (i.9) is not a spirant.
- p. 301, l. 3. Read *hksh*, *hkshn*, *hkshv* (by ix.3); so that *jihvāmūliya* occurs only in the four remaining groups.
- p. 302, l. 23. I can give no reference for *varshābhyaḥ*, the reading at vii.4.13 being *varshyābhyaḥ svāhā varshyābhyaḥ*.
- p. 303, l. 9. I was heedless enough here to overlook the fact that a spirant never stands, according to the rules of this chapter, before either an aspirated surd or a nasal, since a first mute (by rule 9, above) is always inserted in such cases between the two. The groups *ccch* etc., therefore, would be read according to this rule *ccch*, instead of *ccch*. The groups in which a nasal originally follows the spirant will be found catalogued under rule xxi.12 (p. 390). The example *tasmād* etc., below, is therefore no counter-example, and it is G. M. that are in the wrong in so calling it; it is to be read *taspmdit*, according to Plākshi etc., instead of *tasspmāt* (or, with *yama*, *tassppmāt*).
- p. 304, l. 5. See also under xxii.16.
- p. 308, l. 6 from below. Read *dhakāre* for *-ra*.
- p. 315, l. 10. Prof. Hadley's paper may be found printed in full in the Transactions of the American Philological Association (vol. i, 1871, p. 1 ff.).
- p. 334, l. 7. Read vii.5.15<sup>2</sup> (for vii.5.14<sup>2</sup>).
- p. 336, l. 7. "Verbal forms"—that is, of course, all excepting *gīishi*.
- p. 354, ll. 17.25. See p. 426. Prof. Roth's MS. also ends with *samudrāḥ*; he calls my attention, further, to the passage in the Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka (i.1.2), *samudra evā sya* [i. e. *acasya*] *bandhubhū samudro yonih*.
- p. 356, l. 3. For *dīrtā* as synonym of *pracaya*, see below, under xxiii.17 (p. 412).
- p. 364, l. 24. And accordant, it may be added, with the practice followed in the Vājasaneyi-Sanhita, where there is no added figure, and no prolongation of the vowel.
- p. 369, marg. notes, l. 6. The *anudātta*-mark under *gu-* (the second time) has fallen out.
- p. 373, l. 1. Read i.2.51 (for i.2.52).
- p. 386, l. 18. The *e* sign has broken off in the *samhitā*-reading of *āgne*.
- p. 387, l. 7. I have considered this point more fully in a paper on the Sanskrit accent in the Transactions of the Am. Philological Association (vol. i, 1871, p. 20 ff.).
- p. 414, l. 4. Read (in Devanāgarī) *kramavik*, for *kramivak*- (altered in the type, by some mishap, after the last correction).
- p. 425, l. 29-30. *Achāvākāh* is found at vii.1.5.
- p. 428, l. 37. But see, for the commentary, the additional note above to l.15 (or p. 18).
- p. 429, l. 26. The *krama*-text is also quoted under ix.24 (p. 224) by O. alone.
- p. 438, last line but one. Read *gīvi* for xxvi.

